CALEB'S INHERITANCE IN CANAAN: By GRACE, not WORKS.

AN ANSWER

To a Book Entituled

The Doctrine of Baptism, and distinction of the Covenants, lately published, by *Tho. Patient*:

Wherein a review is taken,

I. Of his four Essentials, and they fully answered; *Ergo*
II. Dipping proved no Gospel practice, from cleer Scripture.
III. His ten Arguments for dipping refuted.
IV. The two Covenants answered, and Circumcision proved a Covenant of Grace.
V. His seven Arguments to prove it a Covenant of Works, answered.
VI. His four Arguments to prove it a seale onely to *Abraham*, answered: and the contrary proved.
VII. The seven Fundamentals that he pretends to be destroyed by taking Infants into Covenant, cleered; and the asperſion proved false.
VIII. A Reply to his Answer given to our usual Scriptures. For Infant-subjects of the kingdom, in all which Infant-baptism is cleered, and that Ordinance justifyed,

By *E. W.* a Member of the Army in *Ireland*.

Joh. 1.46. *Can any good thing come out of Nazareth, come and see.*
Rev. 16 15. *Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his Garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame.*
Zach. 13.4,5. *And it shall come to pass in that day, the Prophets shall be ashamed, every one of his vision, and he shall say, I am no Prophet, I am a husband-man. For man taught me to keep cattle from my youth.*

London, Printed for *George Sawbridge*, at the sign of the Bible upon *Ludgate*-hill. 1656.

IN

CANAAN

By GRACE, not WORKS,

AN

ANSWER

To a Book Entitled,

Wherein a review is taken,

The Author to the Christian Reader, especially such who are his Comrades and Brethren, in the Armies of this Commonwealth.

I Shall tell thee no long story of experience to draw on thy belief to embrace either truth, or error, nor do I think that an Argument sufficient to perswade men; besides their reason, and Conscience. 'Tis that which Gods word condemns, in that boasting Church, who to intice and allure others, cryed out she was rich, and indued with substance, and wanted nothing, when yet she was poor and miserable, and blind and naked. He that hath faith in this sense, let him have it to himself before God, and happy is he that condemns not himself in the things he allows. These are boasting days, wherein men in false ways under false Ordinances, pretend to have much communion with God. A day is coming when their works will be manifest, whether wrought in God or not when wood, hey, and stubble will be burnt up: the work is already on the wheele, and a poor doubting Christian then will lye neerer Christs heart, then fleshly boasters: it is not mens pretences to be acquainted with the depths of God, that will

make them sound Christians, such there were in the first times of the Gospel, that would be talking of depths: but the holy Ghost, calls them Satans depths. I could heartily wish that the Author of the new Doctrine of baptism had no cause to doubt of the currantness of his coin, I mean of his principles for heaven: but this I am bold to say, that did I pretend to be such a master in the school of experience, I should not onely question all my teaching, but learning also; especially when it comes with such high swelling words against the ways of God: and let me tell thee, though I have no cause to boast of any thing; yet in this I will lay my experience against his: rejoyce, and boast, with much confidence, and assurance, that those Ordinances which he calls counterfeits, and cryes down for error, &c. and stamps such a black brand of reproach upon, throughout his whole book, shall stand and triumph as the glorious truths of Jesus Christ, in matter of worship, when all his mists and fogs shall be dispelled with the son of righteousness. The Reasons of my undertaking this task, are these which follow;

1 First, Because I thought men of parts and abilities, as they would look upon the piece to be weak, feeble, and inconsiderate; and to deserve no answer, so their time was better imployed then to spare it to such a work.

2 Secondly, Lest any on the other hand, out of ignorance should think it unanswerable, as I hear many that cry it up, who are ready to mis judge, that our silence gives consent thereto.

3 Thirdly, Because most of his Arguments (I perceive) are such as I have lately seen in pieces long since publisht, therefore the answer of him doth answer others of the same strain.

4 Fourthly, Because the standing for this truth, for the interest of Infant Church-seed in the covenant, is a sprig of generation work, as the holy Ghost witnesseth, *Gen.* 17. 9. which

which yet is opposed by our dissenting friends, I have therefore used this Trowel with those in *Nehemiah* 4.

5 Fiftly, And to let good men know there are a few names in *Sardis*, that have not defiled their garments, who are apt to think the contrary.

6 Sixthly, And to give a hand to pull them out that are fallen into Rivers: to reclaim their practice, by informing their judgements, or at least to cause them to make a halt, and to go no further in error; but remember from whence they are fallen and repent.

7 Because the name *T. P.* is lookt upon as the chief in this moist clymate, that bears away the bell; and therefore fittest to be answered, his name being so well known amongst us, as also because, though there hath been never so much said, yet if it comes not forth as an Answer by name, there is but few that will vouchsafe to give it the reading. As if the most part of that judgement, were resolved to act from implicite Faith, or to bolt out the truth, and shut out the light that shines, in so many choice and learned pieces that are publisht, both touching the covenant and baptism.

I cannot but think there are many censorious spirits who will be ready to smite with a reviling tongue; because they are even ready to call the Master of the house *Belzebub*, much more therefore a mean servant. It is the common language of the children of Belial in these days, that if a man do but speak a word for the Ministery, and servants of God, imployed in that work of double honor, as I am here necessitated to do, there goes a Priest-ridden fellow. All I shall say to such, is to remember what *Paul* saith of scoffing *Ishmael*, Gal. 4. 29, 30.

The spirit by which his book was penned, I shall speak little to it here, because occasion will be offered to meet with it so fully in the Answer; onely this I will say, that from

one

one end to the other, I have not met with one Scripture by him quoted, but hath been most shamefully abused, either in Explication, or Application; and if that large story of his experience were right, which he speaks of in his Epistle, it is strange that a man so pretending should not hit the right mark of any one Text. God direct us to understand his Minde and Will: that so we may know the truth, and hold it fast in erring days, when there are so many deceitful counter-truths abroad, that Christians may not mistake the one for the other, and run up and down like *Samsons* Foxes, in days of heat, when so much combustible stubble is abroad, to set all in flames. Methinks the most acceptable news in these Athenian days, to all good men, would be, to hear our fallen Brethren reclaimed, and dissenting Protestant friends united in one Faith, under one Lord, in one Baptism: That hearts and hands being joyned against the common and publike enemy of the truth, the work of our Generation may the better go on and prosper.

Division and dissention is but the Divels bone of hatred and strife cast amongst Brethren; who well knows that nothing is more like to obstruct Gods work in every generation. *As that wise man tells us, how can two walk together except they are agreed?* When persons are disjoyned, in heads, and hearts; be sure they will fall short of the end. Our Lord Christ himself well knew the danger of such Doctrines, when he applyes it to Kingdomes, and Families, and tells us they cannot stand.

Look upon that Image of the four Monarchies in *Daniel* the second, that hath ruled the world. It is division hath been their ruine, when Gold, Silver, Brass, Iron, and Clay have been mixt. It is the glory of the Fifth

Monarchy

Monarchy, that shall stand as long as the world lasts, that it is but one stone cut out: and then it is like to be a swelling one, when the other shall be Babel'd, being smote on the divided Toes and Feet.

Look into *Germany* and *Savoy*, *the streets of the great City*, are not the Witnesses killing there, that are to lye dead three days and a half? If that be so, stand upon your Watch-Towers, Christians; and see *Romes* doom approaching: the expectation of their Isles is mounted, to behold what God is a doing; let all the earth keep silence before him, the hope of *Israel* is at the doors: and e're long *Abrahams* Covenant will be the voice of the people. Those that divide here, so as to cast off this Covenant, are undone, and ruined; those that unite upon Covenant-terms, and own the Conditions, are, and shall be as Mount-Sionn, ever removed.

Look toward the Wilderness: [How goodly are thy Tents O *Jacob*! and see the Church coming out leaning upon her beloved: there will not be an Infant left behinde. It is pitty then to see those who cry out, the Temple of the Lord, to carry on the Dragons design in making war against the Churches seed. It hath been his project from the days of *Abel*; If they are let alone, the Church will soon grow too numerous: therefore *Pharaoh* will play his part, and *Herod* his part; That the voice of *Rachel* may be heard in *Ramah*, weeping for her children, because they are not. If I am thought too hot in the following discourse; let it be considered, that to give an Answer to that book, is to work in the fire, It being so full of Taunts and heats against the Truth.

Reader, This Item I shall leave with thee: Study Controversie so far as to finde the Truth; but take heed

heed of losing thy heart therein; get as much experience as thou canst, but do not blaze it to the world: —— It is a word of advice from him who desires to be

Thy Christian friend

ED. WARREN.

CALEB'S
Inheritance in CANAAN
By Grace, not Works.

CHAP. I.

The Doctrine examined, raised from 2 Act. 37.

IT is the saying of the Holy Ghost, 2 *Tim.* 3. that in the last days *perilous times should come*, and amongst the list of dangerous persons, he tells us there should be *false accusers: despisers of those that were good:* and yet they should be such as *had a form of godliness.* And after he hath laid down what they are in themselves, he also gives a further description of them in their actions: what they should do, and who they should be like, *Now as Jannes and Iambres withstood Moses, so do these men resist the Truth, men of corrupt minds, and reprobate concerning the Faith:* But because the people of God would be fearful what the issue of such things would come to, therefore in ver. 9 he comforts them in this, *That they should proceed no further; for their Folly shall be manifest to all men, as theirs also was.* As if he had said.

ſaid; the way to put a ſtop to ſuch perſons, is to lay open their folly: and to ſhew the world, that their accuſations are falſe: this courſe did *Moſes* take with thoſe Egyptian Prieſts.

The perſon with whom I am to deal in this Reply, hath ſhewed himſelf, in Print, to come in the number of thoſe falſe accuſers, declaring to the world that our practice of Infant-Baptiſm doth fight againſt and deſtroy ſeven fundamental points in the Chriſtian Religion; by which we may ſee his Charge mounts very high, and either he muſt make it good, or elſe he will fall under the guilt of his own folly and blindneſs, if not wickedneſs ſo to affirm. And will be alſo thereby brought under that following deſcription to be *a reſiſter of the Truth*, Co-partner with thoſe falſe Prieſts before mentioned.

I have therefore dealt with him not only in thoſe particulars wherein the accuſation lyes, but have begun and ended with his whole piece: to unvail and diſcover the rottenneſs and deceit thereof, that ſo, ſuch who through weakneſs have been ready to embrace this error in their hearts, may in time diſlodge it.

Theſe are the days wherein *men heap to themſelves teachers*, having itching ears; for what is writ in this book, called *The Doctrine of Baptiſms*, is no more then what long ſince he publikely taught, as may be gathered from his own words. But doubtleſs, if a man ſhould deſire an account of his Miniſterial Authority, by which he entitles himſelf a laborer; it would appear to be more from men then God; and that he was never ordained, to ſuch a work: But is rather in the number of *Jeroboams* Prieſts, who was made of *the loweſt of the people*, in the fulleſt extent of that word.

In pag. 5. We have the ground-work and foundation of all the enſuing diſcourſe, laid down in this Doctrine. That it is the duty of all that believe and repent to be baptiſed; which though it be truly raiſed, yet 'tis falſly applyed, I ſhall therefore examine this Doctrine in the application of it. For as 'tis true, that he that believes and repents, being converted from Judaiſm or Heatheniſm, ought to be baptized; As ſuch were they to whom the Apoſtle preacht in this *Act.* 2. from whence this Author takes his Text; I ſay, as the application of this Doctrine is true to ſuch that never yet imbraced the Goſpel, and ſo never practiſed that Ordinance, ſo on the other ſide, to apply it in ſuch univerſal terms to thoſe that have embraced the Goſpel, and have been baptized, is unſound. For though a Doctrine be never ſo truely raiſed, yet if it be not as truely applyed, it is a wrenching and abuſing the Scriptures, which is eaſily done, when we conſider not the difference and

natur

nature of the Auditors: to cleer which, let us come to some instances; suppose a Church be truely constituted, of which, a great part may be hypocrites, such as were *Judas*, *Magus*, *Ananias* and *Saphira*, *Hymeneus*, *Alexander*, *Phyletus*, mentioned in the Scriptures, all which were never true believers. These, all these, or any of these becoming true Converts, and such as truely repent of their wicked Hypocrisie, is this a Doctrine fit to be applyed to them; without doubt such a practice would quickly overturn the Authors dipt Societies: If he be true to the principles of this Doctrine, as by himself it is applyed; or else his words do imply that such Doctrines of Faith and Repentance is to be preacht onely to such as are without the Church, as if those that were within had no need thereof: when as we know they are Doctrines of the Gospel: which is the kingdoms Gospel, and belongs to such as are within as well as without the kingdom; were I a Minister and should come amongst master *Patients* people, and preach this Doctrine, and apply it as he doth; would he not think it very much knockt out of joynt in the application, to tell them it is the duty of all, who really repent and believe to be baptized; doubtless there is no rational Christian but would so judge: If therefore it holds in one, it must hold also in the other, for it is not persons being hypocrites, or carnal, that nullifies their baptism: no though the Administrator and manner also be circumstantially corrupted and defective: what if *John* had baptized onely by pouring out water which he did (as shall be after proved) when he should have plunged and dipt them as this Author doth; The Ordinance had not been thereby null and void for want of that circumstance. So on the other hand, should this Doctor of dipping convert a Heathen or Jew, and plunge him, when he should have onely poured the water on him after the Primitive practice, yet the baptism stands in force still; yea, though the Author so dipping be no true, real, but a pretended Minister; as *Ziphora*'s circumcising stood in force though she were a defective Administrator; and this is the general sense of Protestant Authors; that those Children or persons that receive Popish baptism by their Priests after they are really converted to the Faith of Christ, ought not again to be baptized: and yet we see they are as ignorant as heathens: by what therefore is said, it is apparent the forementioned Doctrine is not to be extended to all alike, and though it be an undoubted truth amongst such as preach to the heathens in *New-England*, or to such amongst our selves as are yet unbaptized, yet it is not therefore a sutable Doctrine to such as have been before baptized either there or elsewhere. And yet we see with what

fury, and heighth of Confidence this theam is profecuted throughout all his book: Tis alike Argument with this. When Christ sent his Ministers to preach and baptize, their Commission was to go into all the World. Therefore he that is a true Minister of the Word and Baptism must be an Itinerary preacher. *Augustus Cæsar* a Tyrant taxt his people; therefore it is lawful for all Magistrates to tax their subjects: which last hath been a Doctrine so raised by the Author in my hearing.

CHAP. I.

Relating to the Administrator answered.

HAving examined the Doctrine and foundation let us come to survey the building to see what work is made there; he goes to open and explain what is meant by baptism, and so leads us to a new Text, which indeed usually leads the Van Argument: but is here brought in as a prop to uphold the Doctrine before raised, *Mat.* 28. 18. From which two places he hath ingaged to run through the whole Controversie of Baptism in four Essentials by him so called,

1. The Minister
2. The Form
3. The Name into which
4. The Subject.

All which being laid down as so many Essentials, if any one be wanting, the baptism in his sense is made null and void: we are therefore come to examine these several heads, and first the Minister or Administrator: p. 6. preaching Disciples *go ye therefore*, but when he afterwards comes to explain his meaning, who they are, he speaks thus, That Disciple that can bring down God to the soul, and the soul up to God, is a lawful Minister of baptism.] I shall therefore a little search into this unheard of qualification, according to the place by him quoted; first the persons spoken of, had an immediate Commission from Christ. *Go ye therefore*: Secondly, The persons sent were Apostles; men in Office, men of Gifts, for the work; *Go teach all Nations, baptising*, such they were that baptized in a way of office, power, and authority; And because these, therefore every man that undertakes to preach by a Gift, either occasionally or intentively not having any Commission or Call thereto may baptize: is this any lawful deduction, or rather is it not the way

say to destroy the Ministry? by this rule, if there be twenty in the Church of which this Author is a labourer, or Minister, that can preach (or talk rather) as well as himself, they shall therefore take his power of administring these Seals out of his hands. When as both he, and they are bound to desist from any such actions until they are duly and solemnly admitted into an office that capacifies them for the work; And the contrary is condemned by the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 12. *Are all Apostles, are all Prophets, are all Pastors and Teachers,* &c. And therefore God hath set every member in the Church to be useful to the body in his due place: as are the members of the natural body, and not one to intrude upon the other. Consider further

Secondly, If that be all the qualification required for the administration of Sacraments before mentioned, then may a woman be a lawful administrator; for though the title of preaching Disciples reaches onely to the Males: yet that kind of explanation will reach females. What if such a one as *Priscilla*, who was a Disciple, should amongst many of her own Sex, be an instrument to convert some to the Faith? I hope it cannot be denyed but she brings down God to the soul, is it therefore lawful for her to baptize? there must therefore such a restriction be put upon the words as confines them to persons in office, or else we are like to come to a strange kind of Reformation at last. But indeed this kind of qualification, though the full current of the words are rough and harsh; yet may it well suit with their practice, for though they lay much weight upon the thing it self, called *the Ordinance*: yet are they very loose in this which he calls an Essential, namely the Administrator, for if the Pastor or Officer be absent, or sick (but usually they have neither) if the people do but desire such a brother to baptize and give the Sacraments, although it be but for a day, this is lookt upon as a sufficient warrant to make such a person fit for the work, and thus the practice thereof shall run in the vein of Discipleship, one baptising the other, which is expresly against the very nature of the Ordinance, and all Scripture examples and presidents. Look upon *John* the Baptist a Prophet, a man sent by God, the Disciples of Christ, all by himself called and Commissioned: and so they were to administer baptism in a way of Office to the end of the world, and not onely the Apostles, but their successors also, Pastors, Teachers. Which are as well given to the Church, as the Apostles, Prophets, & Evangelists, *Eph.* 4. 11. and do and shall continue so long as the Commission remains till the worlds end: had it been given equally alike to all the Church Disciples, he would not have singled out persons in Office; so *Philip*

an

an Evangelist called by a voice from Heaven *Ananias* called by a vision from God *Act* 9.

Obj. *But Baptisme is an Ordinance that belongs to the Church, and it is in their power to give the keys as they shall judge fit.*

Answ. The Church can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth: nothing without the rule. If granted that all the males have their votes, yet the administration of the keys lies in the Office or Angels power, for administration of the Seals, *Rev.* 21,12. *Ezek.* 44.5,11. Thirdly, Consider yet further how shall we know who is enabled to bring down God to the soul, and the soul up to God? Conversion is an act of Grace, and not in the Creatures power; and though a Minister may be truly called to the work by God and man: yet we know the word may not work for many years, but like seed, may lie hid in the ground, yet, must not this man baptize any, by this rule, though converted by others, because the success of his own labour lies hid, so as that he is not able to say he hath been instrumental in that kind to the souls of his hearers.

In pag. 7. He strikes down our Ministry at a blow, and indeed opposeth diametrically what before he affirmed: 'That though a Minister 'do preach so as to convert, and bring down God to the soul, yet if 'he be ignorant of this practice of dippping, which he calls the true 'way of dispensing the Ordinance and a fundamental: he is no justifiable Minister, that in stead of dipping shall sprinkle carnal ignorant 'Children. By which we may see that the foundation of a true Ministry in his sense, lies more in the water then in conversion: For he denies any true Gospel Ministry, but those of his own stamp. So that when the Apostle *Paul* affirms the truth of his Ministry was evidenced by that Seal, *the seal of my Apostleship are ye in the Lord*, 1 Cor. 9. 2. This Author would have it run, The seal of a justifiable Minister, *are ye in the water*: and thus he destroys not onely the present Ministry of Christ in this world: but also that of the Apostles themselves. For as I shall afterwards prove, they were all strangers to this practice of dipping, their manner being by pouring water on the subject: If Jesus Christ shall then justifie our present Ministry in sealing their labors, it is too bold an act for a man of such a feeble practice to condemn them. Thus the Reader may see his result on both hands; when the Argument is brought against our practice: then no man is a justifiable Minister, except he know how to plunge, and doth so practice, when he comes to shew what a lawful administrator is in his sense, then he that can bring down the soul to God: so that we may from hence see, what

a Babel Ministry this man of contradictions would set up in the world: If I should here ask the Author of this new Baptism, under what Ministry he was converted, no doubt but his answer would be very favourable to those, whom he here opposeth. Remember then your third Doctrine; That 'tis the disposition of such, that have the beginning of saving light, to desire more; and that from them whom God hath spoken to their souls by: Or else you may question whether you have any light at all. But because 'tis to speak a word for the truth, in opposing error, let me therefore return him Talion Law.

1. He that takes the Covenant of Grace for a Covenant of Works, can be no Gospel Minister, because ignorant of the Gospel in the fundamentals thereof.

2. He that affirms a Believer at one time may be under two Covenants of Works and Grace, he is no Minister of the Gospel.

3. He that denies the extent of the Covenant of Grace to be as large and compleat under the Gospel, as it was under the Law, can be no Minister of the Gospel.

4. He that is not lawfully Ordained to the work of the Ministry, he can be no lawfull Minister, because like the false Prophets, he runs before sent.

5. He that shall by his Doctrine and Practice, put greater burthen and yoaks upon the necks of Christians, then ever the false Teachers did by Circumcision, *Acts* the 15. he is no warrantable Minister: But such a one is this Author of the Doctrine of Baptisms; *ergo*. The Minor I shall make appear through this whole discourse, given in as an Answer to his Book. Lastly, as to that contempt and reproach which he casts upon the seed of Believers, who are *Abrahams* children, calling them carnal, ignorant, as though they were uncapable of any good: Let him that rails know, that he that casts off *Abrahams* seed when infants, as not fit matter for worship, doth keep them out as an unclean thing: And so, though God hath separated them to a holy use; they are made unholy, and kept off as execrable, and so accursed: Which the Lord no doubt foresaw, when he gave *Abraham* that promise, *Gen.* 12. *I will curse him that curseth thee.* I say this, this word of the Lord will at last reach such, and pull them down, if their nest were built as high as the stars of heaven. Therefore hear and fear, and do no more so wickedly, all ye that hope for the blessing of *Abrahams* Covenant.

CHAP

CHAP. III.

His second Essential, relating to the manner of Baptisme by Dipping, answered.

THe second Essential he so calls in this Doctrine of Baptisme, is the manner thereof, by Dipping, not sprinkling. To prove which, though he say the word is rendred to Dip, Dous, Drown, or Plunge, in this he speaketh with a hood-wink'd understanding, and must shake hands with the Roman Tribe, that acts from an implicite faith, believing as learned men tels him; though yet he can hardly afford them a good word, or charitable censure. As for the place he brings, 2 *Kings* 5.14. where the Prophet bids *Naaman go wash in* Jordan *seven times, and he dipt himself. Answer*, Though washing is sometimes by dipping; yet not alwaies, yea but seldom. A man may properly be said to wash himself in a River, though he only dips in his hand, and casts water about him, which is most frequent and usual, both in our practice, and acceptation of the word, either in our vulgar, or in Scripture dialect: Were a man to wash his face or head, must he needs dip it; and so of any other part, or the whole body: But let us search the Scriptures, *Mark* 7. 4. *Except they wash they eat not*, and *Luke* 11.38. *They marvel at Christ, that he had not first washt before dinner*: Is any man so void of reason to think, that before the Pharisees sate down, they plunged themselves: And Christ, who well knew what the word to baptize, or wash, signified, gives them such an answer as relates to the powring out of water, so washing onely the outside of things, *verse* 39.

Had their cups and platters, tables and beds, been dipt and so washt, then had inside, outside, and every side, been washt. The word then hath a promiscuous acceptation, some times taken one way, some times another; as *Sidnam* clears this, *Budeus*, *Scapula*, *Pasor*, *Grotius*, do give the sense of the word. Therefore to no purpose is this unlearned Authors Appeal to the Greek, Latin, and English Churches: Though yet, 'tis considerable, that he should acknowledge such as Churches, whom his words and practice do so much cry down; therefore I doubt his charity is much of the same nature with those of the late fifth Monarchy; who though they would use the word of Protestant Churches, yet they did look upon them but as the outworks of Anti-Christ, which were first to be storm'd: For there is scarce a Book extant of the

Anabaptists,

Anabaptists, but hath a touch thereof; such is that Peece called *Th' Storming of Antichrist*, which came out long since, and others of the like stuffe.

'Secondly, he tells us that the phrase in which Baptism is rendered, 'doth usually, and necessarily import such a thing. And therefore when 'mention is made of Baptizing, 'tis commonly translated, in, or into, 'and therefore suits most with dipping, and not that preposition '[with] which suits most with sprinkling; and when our translation 'tells us that *Iohn Baptized with water*, he would correct it *within* '*water*; and instead of *ye shall be baptized with the holy Ghost and with* '*fire*, it should be rendred *in the holy Spirit and in fire*.

Answ: We may see to what height ignorance is mounted, when he that knows not what a preposition is, shall undertake to mend translations: what property of speech can there be in that phrase, *Mark* 1. 8. to say *hee shall baptize you in the holy Ghost, and in fire*, when the word is, *with*: is it possible for a man to be dowst, drown'd or plung'd *into the holy Ghost*, methinks he might blush to shew his ignorance.

But to make this clear, let's view and compare the place with *Acts*. 1. 5. *For Iohn truely baptized with water*, so *Mark* 1. 8. *I have baptized you with water*, and *Math.* 11. *I indeed baptise you with water but ye shall be baptized with the holy Ghost, and with fire*, would it not be strange to read it *into fire*, considering also, that these words relate to the pouring out the holy Ghost, spoken of *Acts* 2. 3. *and there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like unto fire, and it sat upon each of them*, they did not sit in the fire, but the holy Ghost like fire sate upon them; and then in verse. 17. the Apostle *Peter*, who very well knew what was meant by the word Baptize, interprets it, by *Ioell* 2. 31 *to be the powring out of* the spirit propheſied of. And thus when Christs tells them of their being Baptized with the spirit, it appears to be meant of the spirits pouring out, so that from hence its evident, that *Iohns* Baptism was by pouring out water, and not plunging into water, or else it would not have been so conjunctively plac'd with the the manner of the spirits Baptism: *Iohn truely Baptized with water, but ye shall be Baptized with the holy Ghost*. For as the pouring out the holy Ghost was the true Baptism of the Spirit, so *Iohn* truely Baptizing with water, was by powreing it out also; let but any *Englishman* reade it that knowes but how to make sence of what he reads, & it must of necessitie gives a dash to all their plunging; Let therefore such as have been deluded into so groundless a practice consider it and repent thereof.

A second paralell instance to confute this practice of dipping, is that

of *Israels being Baptized in the clouds & in the Sea* 1 *Cor* 10. which by *Paul* the *Apostle* of the *Gentiles*, as before *Peter* was of the *Iews*, *is called a Baptism*: and by what principle of reason or conscience, can any man think that *Israel* was plung'd into either cloud or sea, when the word of God tels us *they marcht through the sea upon drie land*: *Exo*: 14 : 22. the waters being divided, yea *Davids* relating to this very march of *Israel* Psalm the 77. 15. 17. tells us that this Baptism (which *Paul* so calls, in which beleevers and their seed were Baptized) was by pouring out water, and not plunging into water: For thus the word runs, *the clouds poured out water*.

If men therfore will not harden their hearts against the truth and blind their owne eyes, here is light enough to shew us what is meant by this word Baptize; the Authoritie of *Peter* and *Paul* both eminent *Apostles* bearing witness to this truth: & yet wee must be deluded from the truth by ignorant men, against not onely the very light of nature, but of Scriptures also. As for that other Preposition example, which he brings in that page of baptizing in the Wilderness, and in *Jordan*, he tels us it would be improper to render it, with the Wilderness and with *Jordan*, and therfore would urge it to be as improper in that other place.

I answer, the Reader may from hence also gather how sadly fit this man is for a minister, who to make our practice speake nonsence, doth not himselfe know what belongs to a sense. For because the preposition [*with*] is by us maintained proper, when it relates to the matter, or manner, therefore he would have it also as proper when it relates to the place: as if I should say, Master *Patient* hath baptized with the milpool with *Dublin*, for in the milpool in *Dublin*.

4. In Pag. 9. his next place he brings to maintain his dipping is that of *Paul*. 1 *Cor* 10. already touched on, they were all Baptized to *Moses* in the Cloud, and in the sea, not with the clouds and with the sea.

Answ: Which is most proper to say, *Israel were Baptized by pouring out water from the cloud, and by sprinkling from the sea*, or to say, *Israel was Baptized by plunging into the cloud*, and into the sea, for then they must be all over-whelmed with both. And David in the place before-quoted tells us it was done by pouring out water; was it improper to say, *Israel* was Baptized in the sea, when they were in the sea? for though God wrought a miracle to divide the waters, that *Israel* might march upon dry ground, yet was it in the Sea. As when a man hath been in a shoure of raine, Is it improper to say he hath been in the rain, because it is not proper to say he hath been dipt into a cloud? I shall therefore refer this to the consideration of the most judicious

judicious of that Judgment (of which, there are many.) What ground of Reaſon there can be for ſuch a conſtruction as is made of that place, by this Author, and ſhall alſo leave that place, *Exod.* 15. 4, 5. to be thought of as an example, That when the *Egyptians* marched into the Sea, they were baptized in his ſence, *i. e.* Dipt, dowſt, and drowned, but not Gods *Iſrael*; take heed therefore of your too eager purſuit of *Abrahams* Seed; who as they were then, ſo ſtill are baptized by pouring or ſprinkling.

Fifthly, In *Page* 10. the next place he brings for dipping, is in *Acts* 8. 38, 39. *Philip* baptized the *Eunuch*, they being both in the water, he dipt the *Eunuch*, as *John* did Jeſus, *Matth.* 3. 16.

Anſw. And much at one, that is, the Eunuch was as much plunged as Chriſt was plunged; for they were neither of them ſo baptized. It hath been already proved, that *Johns* manner of baptizing, was not by plunging, but pouring out water; and therefore that Text, *Matth.* 3. 16 ſtands for a cypher in this particular. A man may as properly be ſaid to go downe into the water, and come up out of the water, though not wet-ſhod, as if he had been dipt all over: So was *Iſrael* in the Sea properly, and yet not dipt; beſides, *Philip* was as much in the Water as the Eunuch, and in that conſtruction they muſt be both plunged; but not a word is here of the *mode* of Baptiſm, onely he baptized him, the manner muſt be pickt out of other Scriptures, which may be eaſily gathered from what hath been already ſpoken: There may be other Reaſons alſo given, why it could not be by dipping, as that the Eunuch was upon a journey travelling homeward, and therefore neither he, nor *Philip*, provided with garments ſuitable for ſuch a work, it being accidental to them both: For if it be a Goſpel Ordinance, it muſt not be done, they being both naked; for ſo it would have been an action of no good report, contrary to *Pauls* rule. And indeed, take it in the moſt ſerious manner, as now practiſed, yet there is no ſhew of carriage or deportment ſuitable to the Majeſty of the Goſpel of Chriſt, which may eaſily appear to any ſober Chriſtian, whoſe eyes are not darkned by ignorance or blinde zeal: For what gravity can there be for a Miniſter, who is Gods Ambaſſador to the World, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20. to put off his ſhooe's and ſtockings, and to lead a Gentlewoman by the hand into a River, and throw her on her back? Is this a deportment fit for Ambaſſadors that come from God? whoſe holineſs is ſuch, that will not permit a Woman to be uncovered or unvailed in the Church, and ſhall we think then he will own ſuch inhumanities? Methinks the very naming hereof ſhould be a ſufficient

confutation, which is enough to make a modeſt face to bluſh. Alſo conſidering, that either Subject or Adminiſtrator, and perhaps both, may be of ſo tender, weak, and feeble conſtitution, as they are not able to undergo the cold. Many ſuch conſiderations falls in, that were it practiſed amongſt Heathens, that do by nature the things contained in the Law; that very light amongſt them would condemn it.

Sixthly, He argues in *Page* 10. from *Johns* Baptiſm, his work being to Baptize, he remained near *Jordan*, and afterwards at *Enon* near *Salem*, becauſe there was much Water in that place. *Ergo*, He baptized by dipping

Anſw. It hath been already proved from *Mark* 1.8. with *Acts* 1. 3. and *Chap.* 2.17. which relates to *Joel* the ſecond, That *Johns* Baptiſm was not by dipping but pouring out Water; and therefore this cannot be the reaſon why he choſe that place, namely, Becauſe there were many Waters to dip. Other Reaſons muſt be therefore given, as, That becauſe the work of baptiſing a whole Region was very great; and *John* not onely baptiſing himſelf, but very likely, having made Diſciples which he taught more immediately, *Luke* 11. 1,2. *John* 4. 1,2. *Matth.* 11.2,3. *Luke* 7. 18. as Chriſt did his Diſciples: He alſo might ordain and appoint them to the work, that ſo when the whole multitude of people came together, they might have each a ſhare of the work, and conveniency of place accordingly, becauſe there were many waters, when other parts of the Country were very ſcarce thereof; as not onely Hiſtory, but Scripture mention; track *Iſraels* march from *Egypt*.

Surely, had this Author of the Doctrine of Baptiſms lived in *Spain*, or in many parts of *Zona-torida*, where they ſell Water as we do Beer, not having enough to drown a man in a Country; he would have been of a more ſober judgment. Adding this alſo thereto, That when *John* baptized *a whole Region, both men and women*, rich and poor; either, he muſt ſend out Orders to all the Country, to bring ſuitable Garments, which the poor, it is likely, could not do, or elſe promiſcuouſly he muſt dip them naked, or, in ſuch Garments as they wear; the unworthineſs of which practice is already ſhewn: Therefore it is much to think, that a perſon who pretends to Preach the Goſpel, as this man doth, ſhould be ſo purblinde, having his eyes ſhut againſt the truth. But that God deals ſo by men in a way of Juſtice, when they *ſet up idols in their hearts, he anſwers them according to their idols*, *Ezek.* 14. 1,3,4,5. a place by himſelf afterwards quoted, though falſly applied.

Page the eleventh and twelfth, contains his ſeventh, eighth, and ninth Arguments, which may be all put together, becauſe all alike, and the confutation of one anſwers the reſt; where he tells us, That Baptiſm ought to be by dipping, is proved from the nature of the Ordinance; and from the Analogy, it hath with the Death, Burial, and Reſurrection of Chriſt, many places he brings, but to very little purpoſe. And therefore I anſwer with Mr. *Sidenham*

1. That plunging cannot repreſent it, is moſt clear; for when Chriſt was buried, he was not plunged into the Earth, but laid *in* Joſephs *Sepulchre cut out of a Rock*, Matth. 27. 6. which was the manner of burials amongſt the Jews; and if covering all over, though in a Rock, was ſufficient, to cauſe ſuch a reſemblance by dipping, then had Chriſt been covered in a Houſe or Coffin for three days; it muſt alſo have been ſo reſembled.

2. Neither doth it anſwer to the mode of burying amongſt Chriſtians in *Europe*, or elſwhere: For the Earth, by which the perſon is covered, is applied to the ſubject, and caſt upon him; ſo that the applying of water to the ſubject in Baptiſm, as *John* did, in thoſe places before quoted, [*I indeed baptize you with water, &c.*] doth more lively repreſent Chriſts burial, then dipping can. To what purpoſe therefore is it for a man to heap up a multitude of Scriptures, as this Author hear doth, to make all ſure, when he is wholly miſtaken in the thing, and manner thereof, and not one of thoſe Texts proves, that ever Chriſt was ſo buried?

Seventhly. *Page* 13. he comes to his tenth Argument to prove 'Baptiſm by dipping, namely, becauſe it holds forth a conformity to 'Chriſt in his ſufferings. So ſaith Chriſt, *I have a Baptiſm*, meaning his death, *and can ye be baptized with the Baptiſm wherewith I am 'baptized*; meaning his afflictions. And this is ſet forth by dipping 'into water, becauſe when the Saints in the Scripture expreſs their 'afflictions, they ſet them forth by being in the depths, *Pſal.* 130. '*Out of the depths have I cried.* And *Iſa.* 43. 2. *When thou paſſeſt 'through the waters, they ſhall not overflow thee*: Therefore Believers 'are to be dipt all over into the water; and as he is raiſed up again by 'the hand of the Miniſter, it holds forth, that ſo ſuch ſouls, ſhall be 'ſaved from all their afflictions by Chriſt. *Pſal.* 34. 17. *Many are the 'afflictions of the righteous, but God delivereth them out of all*: And 'that this doth ſignifie our Salvation, doth further appear, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. '*Alike figure whereunto Baptiſm even ſaves us*: And *Mark* 16. 16. 'He that believes, and is baptized, or dipt, ſhall be ſaved.

Anſw.

Answ. Whatstrange Hieroglyphicks doth this Author make in the Water, by dipping? What stretcht inferences to make the Scripture answer his fancy? let's try the places. If Christ calls his afflictions a Baptism, doth it therefore follow, That all Believers should represent it by plunging? We know that many Christians never meet with such afflictions; and such a practice to be so plunged, would be a greater affliction then ever befel them; and the place implies this, to be in deep waters, is an affliction; or, would this new Doctor have Believers do themselves a mischief, to represent Christs afflictions: Which of necessity, thousands must do by this practice of dipping. It is no hard matter to give several instances hereof.

Secondly, What should such do to represent those afflictions of Christ, that have not water enough in a Country, except they should make deep Ponds or Vessels of purpose. Did ever the Martyrs in Queen *Maries* days, or the Primitive persecutions, take that course, and yet no doubt but they were as much baptized into Christs death and afflictions, as ever this Author could be, though with his practice he should give his body to be burnt, to justifie the same. Therefore, let the judicious but impartially judge, what strange doctrines this Laborer, for dowsing, brings. *What though* David *cried to the Lord out of the depths*; yet his head stil kept above water: unless he will affirm, that the promise in the place, by himself quoted *Isai.*43. 2. was not made good unto him, [*when thou passest through the water, it shall not overflow thee.*] And though afflictions shall never quite overflow a childe of God, yet by this doctrine the body must be dipt all over: A strange resemblance!

The like we may say to that of 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. by which he would prove, That Baptism is a figure of Salvation, though yet, it cannot be by dipping under water, because the Apostle calls it a like figure to the Ark: But the Ark was never under water, but always floating, and so the persons that were in the Ark; therefore if Baptism be a like figure, then it needs no going under water for a signification: For had the Ark been dowst under water, the signification had been lost, or at least not so clear. By this therefore, we may take the hint of an other Argument, to prove dipping under water, not to be the Scripture way of baptising. Thus we may see how fully and apparently even his own Scriptures, makes against both his Book and practice.

As to that other place, *Matth.*16.16 it is quite besides the business; for it doth not prove Baptism to be a figure of Salvation: *onely he that believes and is baptized, i. e.* obeys the Gospel, *shall be saved.* Thus then

then his second Essentiall of dipping hath been examined with all his ten arguments: upon which this Author of the doctrine of Baptisme doth build the whole stress and fabrick of dipping-grown persons with soe much heat and confidence, and such slighting contempt of his opposers, and upon the whole result it appears but as a bubble quickly broken, *Ergo* dipping is no Essentiall.

CHAP. IV.

His third head of Essentialls concerning the name into which persons are Baptized.

WEE are come now to examine and look into this third Essentiall (by him so call'd) of dipping into the name of 'the Father &c. as 'tis by him opened page 14. 15. 16. and 24. in which 'hee tels us a person cannot be rightly Baptized into the name, except 'he be able to give a distinct Accompt of the Trinitie of persons in their severall operations. Let us therefore review those primitive and 'Apostolicall examples.

Answ: The Baptism of *John*, none will denie, but his Baptism and Ministerie was from God, and so a Gospell-Baptizm: did the persons he Baptized give this Account? the contrarie is most evident, and that they claimed a right to that ordinance as being *Abrahams* seed to whom the covenant was made: therefore when the *Pharisees* came to be Baptized, who lived not as *Abrahams* Children, hee turns them back with a reproof, *think not to say within your selves you have Abraham to your Father: for you are a generation of Vipers.* Had not the rest been receaved upon that consideration as *Abrahams* seed; the reproof had not been suitable: but no mention is made of their distinct knowledg in the mystery of the Trinitie.

Secondly had this been an essentiall, then was *Johns* Baptizm quite null, and the Apostles also before Christs death: for the third person was not, so eminently known nor sent, because Christ was not then glorified, yea *Johns* disciples never heard whether there were any holy Ghost, therefore how could they beleeve in him (and so confess him) so distinctly and eminently? *Rom.* 10. 14.

This further appears by considering the commission it selfe, and the practice of the disciples thereupon: the words of the Commission are, *goe teach all nations &c. teaching them to observe whatsoever I command*

you

you. In which something is to be taught before, somthing after Baptism, now that which is to be taught before is so much as capacifies them *to be disciples*, for so our opposits give the Rendition of the words, *goe disciple all nations*. As a Child then may be a disciple when he firſt begins to learne his A. B. C. ſo may a Chriſtian bee a diſciple of Chriſt without ſuch a high pitch of Knowledg into the myſtery of the Trinitie. For without all peradventure, the Apoſtles themſelves were ignorant thereof though Baptized, when Chriſt firſt called them, and were afterwards taught further by degrees; for the Scripture tells us they were diſciples before they knew how to pray *Luke*. 11. 1. 2.

Fourthly, That this is no Eſſentiall, further appears, if we view the practice of the Apoſtles after Chriſts aſcenſion; as for inſtance, that place *Acts* 2. where ſo many thouſands were Baptized together, can any reaſonable man think that they all gave ſuch a diſtinct Accompt of their faith into the perſons of the Trinitie, and that in one day. The like alſo in the Eunuch *Acts* the 8. what Accompts did he give, but onely I beleeve that Ieſus Chriſt is the ſonn of God, and ſurely had there been more needfull, when he asked that queſtion, what hinders? *Philip* would not have Baptized him before he had given a fuller accompt into all the perſons of the Trinitie, For to what purpoſe had it been, when his Baptiſm had been null for want thereof; the like inſtance alſo is that of *Simon Magus Acts* 8. then *Simon* himſelfe beleeved alſo and was Baptized, and yet afterwards hee appeared to be ſoe Ignorant of the holy Ghoſt, that he would have bought the gifts thereof with money, yea were this to be decided by the *Anabaptiſts* themſelves there would not be one in twentie rightly Baptized, ſuppoſing (though not granted) their practice to be true, For how few amongſt them are able to give ſuch an account of the Trinitie of perſons, when as alſo many of them, to my knowledg, and that not of the meaneſt, denie the perſonalitie of the holy Ghoſt at all? we may therefore ſee what new doctrines are intruded upon the conſciences of weake Chriſtians, by men that doe not underſtand what an Eſſentiall is, yet I would not be ſo underſtood as that I ſhould deny the forme of words, to all within the Covenant, when the ordinance is adminiſtred, or that I plead againſt a prepoſition or confeſſion of faith, from ſuch as are converted and not Baptized, which yet may be, as hath been here proved, though there may be much ignorance of ſo high a miſterie; thus alſo having examined this head, we find that the name into which Beleevers with their ſeed are Baptized is, not ſo to be applyed, as that a perſon ought not to be baptized, unleſs he can ſo diſtinctly anſwer to this

Doctors

Doctors new Catechisme, *Ergo* such a kind of knowledg, is no Essentiall.

CHAP. V.

Relates to the subject fit for Baptism, in which the whole Scriptures give in their votes to beleevers and their Infants.

IN *Page* the 17 hee comes to his last head of Essentialls, namely the subjects to whom the ordinance is to be administred, laid down in 'these termes, *Disciples*, penitent persons: the Texts he brings are '*Mark.* 16. 16. *goe preach the Gospell* &c. *he that beleeves and is bap-*'*tized shall be saved*, compared with *Matth.* 28. 10. *Goe teach all* '*nations Baptizing.*

Answ: To cleare these places we are to consider, that before the death of Christ the Gospell, *i. e. Abrahams* Covenant was shut up to the Jewish nation onely; And therefore the wall of separation, being broken down by the death of Christ, he inlarges that commission to all nations which before was confined to the Jewes, According to that old prophesie of *Noah Gen.* 9. 27 *God shall inlarge Iapheth; and he shall dwell in the tent of Shem.* So that look what priviledges the Jewes had before, and in what sence they were disciples, and *Canaanites* made subject to them; In the same large extent the same priviledges of covenant-discipleship, was by this commission publisht to the world. *i. e.* to all nations. Goe teach all nations, *i. e.* open *Abrahams* covenant to all nations, *i. e.* Let all nations upon embracing the Gospell and submitting to the conditions of *Abrahams* covenant, (for there can be no other Gospell taught,) have the same benefit of being disciples that the Jews had before, that is, both they and their seed; for so tis cleare the Jews and their Children were disciples, *Esa* 8. 16. seale *the law amongst my disciples.* And *Acts* 15: they were those *upon whose necks the false teachers would lay the yoke of Circumcision after the manner of Moses*, and are called in verse 10. *Disciples.* Another cleare text for this is *Math* 10 last verse, *whosoever shall give to one of these little ones a cup of cold water, onely in the name of a disciple, shall not loose his reward* where we have three sorts of persons named, *a Prophet: a righteous man*, and *a little Child*, and the least of these *called a disciple by Christ himself*; that, *by little ones is meant* Children, and not beleevers Adult, is plain, because that otherwise it had been Tautologie, the word

righteous man including all such Adult-believers. [See this place also to prove children disciples, *Matth.* 21.15. with *Luk.* 19.37,39.] For the whole verse runs in diminitives, both as to the favors shewn, and the person to whom: For as a less favor could not well be extended for Christs sake, then the giving a cup of water, so it could not be extended to a less subject, then to an Infant-disciple. The same word is used, *Matth.* 18. 2,3,4,5,6. The result comes to this, That if Children were disciples amongst the Jewish Nation, to whom the Gospel or Covenant was first preached; and this new Commission was given by way of enlargement of that Covenant to all Nations, baptizing, *&c.* 'Tis then evident, that children of Believers are now also disciples, therefore fit subjects for Baptism; and the putting of any other sence upon the place, as our opposites do (in all their Books lately published) is but a resting and abusing the holy Scriptures. And

Secondly, All those other Texts by this Author brought for baptising of Believers in *Page* 17,18,19. are those, which in a right sense we deny not, provided, (as hath been already said) They are converted from Judaism, or Heathenism; or such amongst our selves that have for several years past, neglected their Baptism. An example whereof, we may take from the practice of our Brethren of *New England*, in baptising many Heathens, lately converted, which this Author might have seen, had he staid there a little longer, and been as Patient in nature, as he is by name.

The next proofs he brings to prove Adult-believers, and not Children, to be the onely subjects of Baptism, is all those Families, *Page* 20. mentioned in the New Testament, where this opposit undertakes to prove they were all converted Disciples, such as upon hearing the Word, did actually believe hitherto notwithstanding any thing he hath said. As in *page* 18. That God commands his Ministers to dip Believers onely: It hath been proved, and that by *the testimony of two Apostles*, That dipping is not the Scripture-way of baptising; and that Adult-believers are not the onely subjects of Baptism, is in part cleared: And though he is pleased to say, The Apostles did baptize onely such, it shall appear, That what he affirms therein, is against the very scope and minde of God, through the Scriptures, in these following examples.

1. The first Family Text he quotes is that of *Lydea*, *Acts* 16. 14, 15. *And a certain woman named* Lydea, *a seller of Purple, of the City of* Thiatira, *which worshipped God, heard us, whose heart the Lord opened that she attended, &c. And when she was baptized and her house-*

hold,

hold, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and she constrained us. Which Family Mr. *Patient* saith, were all Believers, *Verse* 40. which *Paul* and *Sylas* went to visit.

Answ. The consideration of the words preceding the Text, and the several circumstances, will give a clear light to finde out the truth; by him (and many Scribes of a late edition of that party) obscured and darkned.

First, The persons that were met together, were onely women.

Secondly, Of all those Women met, we finde onely *Lydea* converted.

Thirdly, Upon her conversion, we finde her household baptized, and that at the same time: By which it is apparent, that she took with her, her family to the place of worship; for thus the words run, *And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If you have judged me faithful to the Lord, come with me, &c.* Both she and her household, were baptized before they went home; by which also, we may very lawfully gather,

1. That there were no men at the meeting.

2. That therefore those Brethren afterwards mentioned, could not be then at that time converted, because, had there been men, and they wrought upon, the Holy Ghost would not have overslipt them, to take notice onely of the Female: Therefore it is evident, That those Brethren spoken of, *Verse* 40. were either some of the Family afterwards converted, or some other of the City, then met at her house, which were after *Lydea*'s conversion, wrought upon, because we finde *Paul* and *Sylas* were committed to prison; and it is likely, it was upon that converting work, which the Gospel made amongst them, according to the voice that called them, *come over and help us.* Or 3. they might be believing Brethren from other parts, that came to buy Purple, because we finde the Spirit of God taking such exact notice of her profession, *Vers.* 14. But that those Brethren, were converted at that time, when she and her household were baptized, is against the expres Letter of the Text, as any observant Reader may see. This Text therefore makes against Mr. *Patient*; for if *Lydea* and her household were baptized, when we finde onely *Lydea* converted: And if by house, is meant Children, as I shall afterwards prove it is, then it is agreeable to the very minde of *God*, to say, That her believing gave her Children a right to Baptism, because we do not finde any that believed, but her, and yet we finde all her household baptized. Thus

then this p'ace breaks forth with much clear light, dispelling those foggs of error that scribbling pens have cast upon it.

Secondly, The next place hee brings is the Jaylor and his house, *Acts* 16. *who rejoyced in God with all his house,* [*hee beleeving*] For so the words are truly rendred, by which it doth not appear the whole house beleeved, but the whole house rejoyced, and yet, both he and his whole house were Baptized. Secondly 'tis observable, the exhortation given the Jaylor runs in the very strains of *Abrahams* covenant, *Gen.* 17. *walke before me, And I will bee thy God and the God of thy seed;* so here, *beleeve, and thou shalt be saved and thy house,* so *Acts* 2. *when they were pricks in heart, as this Jaylor was, Repent and be Baptized, the promise is to you and your Children:* so here *verse* 33. *hee was Baptized, he and all that were of him.* A fuller expression could not well be used, to set out his Children by, who may properly be said to bee of their Parents, and none but they. Therefore, if the Jaylor and all that were of him were Baptized, when onely the Jaylor beleeved, though all rejoyc'd, then he and his Children were Baptized; unless any man can be so unreasonable as to say, that those that were of him were not Children; which to affirme, will but rather discover weakeness then Eclipse the truth.

Thirdly, A third example which holds forth a clearer light to the preceding, is that of *Zacheus, Luke* 9. who was *a Gentil.-Publican* yet upon Christs calling him, hee useth this argument, *to day I must abide at thy house,* and in *verse* 9. *this day is salvation come to this house, For as much as hee also is a Son of Abraham:* In which word [*also*] the very covenant of grace made with *Abraham* and his seed is confirmed to him and his house though a Gentile, that had no relation to *Abrahams* seed by birth, yet, *thou also though a Gentile, art the son of* Abraham; *and therefore salvation is come to thy house.* Noteworthy are the collections of faithfull Sydenham, from this place, whose little peece hath made their water-workes totter, and remains not onely unanswered, but unanswereable, though the spattering of a scratching pen hath given a late attempt to little purpose. His collections are these, first, 'that assoon as *Zacheus* beleeved, Christ, applyed '*Abrahams* promise to his house; And if there had not been something 'more in it, he would have said onely, salvation is come to thee: For 'the spirit of God doth not put a syllable more in the Scriptures then 'is usefull and necessarie.

Secondly Hee opens *Abrahams* covenant not onely to him, but his 'house, and argues the privileg from his being a son of *Abraham*, though

'though a Gentile, shewing that *Abrahams* covenant hath as large 'an extent amongst the Gentiles, as it had amongst the Jews *to a 'beleever and his seed*; otherwise it had been enough to have said 'salvation is come to thee: but to mention his house with himselfe, and 'to bring them into the blessing, and give this as a reason, *because 'thou also art a son of Abraham*, is as much as to say, that the priviledges 'of *Abrahams* covenant are the same to thee a Gentile and thy house, 'as they were to *Isaac*, for as much as thou also art a son of 'Abraham, as well as hee Now for Christ to speak in this dialect, and 'to tell them of their household and his favour to them, and that 'in the beginning of the Gospells planting, and yet at the same time 'to exclude their infants from all outward signes of the promise, 'which they ever had in darkest dayes of Grace, is a strange policie 'unsuitable to the simplicitie of the Gospell.

These are such plain examples, that I marvell what kind of conscience men pretend to have, when they shut out the sun that shines in these scriptures, and cry out they are full of darkness.

Fourthly, The next place and example brought by this Author, is the house of *Stephanus*, whom *Paul* Baptized; A Triumphant place so thought, to prove that there was no Children in those housesmentioned 1. *Cor.* 11. 6. *chap* 16. 15. the words run thus; *I beseech you brethren you know the household of* Stephanus, *that it is the first fruits of* Achaia: *that they have addicted themselves to the ministerie of the Saints; That yee submit your selves to such, and to every one that laboureth with us*: where saith Master *Patient*, wee see they were all ministers, and men that laboured with the Apostles, therefore not Babes or Children.

Answ: The Apostle doth not say they were all Ministers, or such as laboured in the word and doctrine, as he did himselfe; But they are so said to Minister, because they addicted themselves to the ministring to the Saints, in a way of *Hospitalitie*, for so the word is taken for releeving the Poor and so the same *chap.* refers to 1 *Cor.* 16. namely a free, liberall and charitable collection for the poor Saints: *verse* 1. 2. 3. and 2 *Cor* 8. 4. *chap.* 9. 1. *now as touching the Ministring to the Saints, 'tis superfluous for me to write* &c. In which places the same word is used, as here in this example of *Stephanus* and his house, who addicted themselves to the Ministerie of the Saints. by which it appeares, that as the Apostle had boasted of others in the former *chap.* so in this also hee commends the freenes and Hospitalitie of *Stephanus*; because in such actions there is much heartsinceritie to be seen, in entertaining poor Christians, This being so, then

Then tis no hard matter to know, who is meant by the houſe of *Stephanus* which *Paul* Baptized. For though the ſervants 'tis likely might be gracious, and full of love to poor Chriſtians, yet by the word *houſe* is properly meant, Parents and Children, and 'tis very unlikely, the ſervants of the houſe ſhould be ſo free and hoſpitable of their Maſters goods. And as for the Children, they were taken in by their Parents Actions and ſo the whole houſe is commended, For the hoſpitalitie of *Stephanus* and his yoakfellow, as 'tis uſuall in ſuch cauſes, to ſay, ſuch a houſe is noble and free, when 'tis meant onely of the heads and chief of the family, and theſe were the perſons that *Paul* preſſeth the Church to honour and eſteem; and to ſubmit to ſuch; And not to ſuch onely, but to every one alſo, that helpeth with us, and laboureth. But 'tis a ſtretcht inference to ſay, that becauſe his houſe addicted themſelves to the miniſtrie of the ſaints, therefore they were all preachers, and ſuch as laboured in the Goſpell, and the Church was to ſubmit themſelves to all the houſhold *i. e.* ſervants, and all as miniſters, therefore no Children. The like alſo the Apoſtle preſt them in the following verſe to ſubmit to *Fortunatus* and *Achicus*, who came with a ſeaſonable and refreſhing releef and ſupply to their wants; *therefore acknowledg ye them that are ſuch*, verſe 18. *i. e.* ſuch who miniſter releef to Chriſtians in neceſſitie. So *Matth.* 8. 15. 'tis ſaid that *Peters Wives Mother miniſtred to Chriſt.* Maſter *Patient*, ſurely will not be ſo far beſides himſelfe, to think that ſhe preacht to Chriſt, as a miniſter; from what then hath been alſo ſaid to this inſtance, 'tis abundantly clear to any ſober ſpirit who is willing to ſearch after truth, and not take things barely upon the count of Maſter *Patients* word. Our oppoſites have not ſo honeſtly quitted themſelves in al their writings in interpreting this text, to lay a ſnare, or decoy, to intrap, or intice people into the lake of error, by ſaying that here was none but Adult-beleevers in this houſe, when as the tenor of thoſe Scriptures hitherto which related to houſholds, hath ſtill run to the children upon the parents beleeving.

Queſt. But how ſhall I know, whether, when the Scripture ſpeaks of houſe, there were any Children? for the word is not expreſt; they might be houſholds and yet no Children.

Anſw. 'Tis the common way in finding out the mind of God in Scriptures to compare them, that ſo what is darke in one, may be cleard by the other: And ſince the ſpirit of God at the firſt tender of the Goſpell, did delight to ſpeak to Jew and Gentile, in the Old

Teſtament

Testament Dialect, as to say of *Lydea*, She and her House, the Jaylor and his House, *Cornelius* and his House, *Stephanus* and his House, *Zacheus* and his house; so *Crispus* believed in God with all his house, the house of *Aristobulus*, the house of *Narcissus*; it is as if he had said, If you would know what I mean by this word *house*, then look back to my *First will and Testament*; for what it was then, it is now. Therefore when upon review, we shall finde in the Old Testament, there were Children mentioned, and chiefly included; It will be then an undoubted truth to say, and maintain, That in all these houses mentioned to be baptized, there were Children, which properly gave the denomination, and they all baptized whilest little ones, upon the Belief or Covenant-right of their Parents. See *Gen.* 12. 3. *In thee shall all the families of the Earth be blessed:* Who are so properly the Family as Children? *Chap.* 30. 30. *And when shall I provide for my own house also?* Who was that house that *Jacob* was bound to look after, and provide for, but his Wife and Children. And *Chap.* 45. 18, 19. *Then said* Pharaoh, *Say unto thy Brethren, take your Father, and your Houshold, and come unto me.* And *Verse* 19. it is explained to be their little ones, Wives, and Fathers. So *Num.* 3. 15. 2 *Sam.* 23. 5. *Josh.* 24. 15. So the Apostle, *He that provides not for his own house, i. e.* His Children, *is worse then an Infidel, and hath denied the Faith,* 1 *Tim.* 5. 8. What denying the Faith can this be, for such as profess Christ, if it be not the Faith of that Covenant of Grace, into which Believers and Professing-Christians with their Seed, are admitted? The neglect of a Heathen-Parent, in not providing for his Children, cannot be called a denying the Faith, but the denying the Law of Nature. But the neglect of Christians in not providing for their Children, is a denying the Faith, because visibly within the Covenant. *Exod.* 1. 1. *Prov.* 31. 11. 1 *Sam.* 20. 15. 2 *Sam* 9. 3, 9. 1 *King.* 17. 11, 13, 21, 22, 23. *Psal.* 127. 1, 3. *Prov.* 12. 7. *Hos.* 1. 4. 1 *Tim* 3 4, 5. & 5. 4, 8. 2 *Tim.* 1. 16. A full Text also is, That where the Prophet speaks of *Israels* conversion, and gathering under the Faith of Christ, yet to be fulfilled. *Jer.* 31. 1. *At that time, saith the Lord, will I be the God of all the Families of* Israel, *and they shall be my people:* A Text so remarkable, that it is enough to convince any man, that, look what God was to *Israel*, and the Families of *Israel*, in blessing them, as their God; *i. e.* aged in Covenant with them, and their Seed, so he will be the same God again to *Israel*, and their Families in Gospel-days: Which time is near at hand, and they, and their Seed, whilst Babes, shal be his people, so that either our opposits must oppose

that

that doctrine of the *Jews* conversion, when both they and their Children shall be brought into the Faith of Christ, or else of necessity they must acknowledge the truth by us maintained.

Now then to sum up all, the premisses considered, and that upon the advantage the Spirit of God puts into our hands, in explaining what is meant by the word *house*, himself, who is a better Expositor, then Mr. *Patient*, or any else; We see the whole Catalogue, or Cloud of Family-Witnesses and Examples, in Scripture, do give in their Light and Testimony to *Abrahams* Infant-seed. And that when the Scripture speaks of Households baptized, it is meant Parents and Children; and when a Master of a Family was converted, and became the son of *Abraham*, as *Zacheus*, though a Gentile, his Seed, or House also, were taken visibly into Covenant, *Luke* 19. 3,6. So that by this time, we see the vanity, and self-confidence of this Author, to speak such bitter words of Gall and Wormwood, as he doth in *page* 23. against a world of people; who, as he saith, from Custom, and Tradition, run headlong after this Idol of mans invention. By which it is evident, That whosoever embraceth not this new doctrine of dipping, which hath already been proved, not Apostolical; he is no otherwise look'd upon, or esteemed, then, yea called an Idolater. And thus not onely the Truths of God, and Priviledges given to all Gods people, suffer; but also the Powers and Authorities of these Nations come to be undervalued, slighted, and contemned, for practising or countenancing such Idolatries. Thus the dark-side of the Cloud, by this, appears onely to such spirits, when the *Israel* of God, *i. e. Abrahams* Seed, have light within their dwellings. Ye therefore who have upright hearts to God, and his ways, that have been hitherto led in these untrodden paths, and so have lost the way, enquire after the footsteps of the flock, and have more pity to your own bowels: Cut not off their entail to Grace, by losing your visible right and title to the Covenant, in which the invisible part thereof is conveyed. What though they are born in sin and iniquity, yet the Promise reaches them whilst yong, as it reached *Isaac* when a Childe. If you are not wanting in your duties, your children have a Gospel-right; the Seed of the *Jews* had it, yea, they shall have it again to the same Covenant. Take heed least your Children cry out against you at the last day, and say, their cruel Parents took away their Bread, and gave away their birth-right for nought. Let me therefore say with the Prophet, It hath and shall be for a lamentation, to see Christians kick against their own mercies. And let me leave this with you Mr. *Patient*,

Rom.

Ro. 2. 22. thou that abhorrest an Idoll, dost not commit sacriledge, by stealing away a Church ordinance from those to whom God hath given it: Thus far his four Essentialls are weighed, over which we may write that superscription Daniel. 8. 15. Mene Mene [tekel vphar sin thou art weighed in the ballance and found too light.

CHAP. VI.

Page 23. 24. Is a preludium to the subsequent chapter touching the Covenant.

WEE are now come to view that passion of Weakness that lies in those two Pages, and first, of his distinction given of Idolatrie, which though I grant to be good; yet he still mistakes in application: for hee comes again to tell us, that in the room of this 'precious Ordinance of God, the dipping of beleevers, which Christ 'hath confirmed by his blood, is set up an Idoll of mans invention, 'namely the sprinkling of Carnall poor infants; and doubeless if there 'be an Idoll in the world, now set up amongst men, this must needs 'be one in his sence, because he hath learnt this to be an Idoll, either 'the worshipping a false God, or the true God in a false manner, &c.

Answ. Let any reader Judg whether this man of the waterie element doth not speak with as high a piece of confidence, as if he had a spirit of infallibilitie to judg our practice by, hee tells us that dipping of beleevers, was an ordinance confirmed, by the blood of Christ, therefore sprinkling of Children must needs be an Idoll his Allegations have been examined in all the parts thereof, and we still find (notwithstanding any thing he hath said to the contrarie) that Childrens Baptism remains an Ordinance, That dipping is not the way of the Gospel; and therefore I must tell him, that dipping was never confirm'd by Christs blood; *Ergo*, He speaks untruths in the name of the Lord: neither is it an Idoll of the first or second magnitude; no Image of Baptism, set up in the room thereof by mans invention, which are terms by him used, to bespatter the truth. But the contrary is proved, The Administrators Right, a person qualified and ordeined; the manner, by sprinkling or pouring out water Right, the form of words Right, and the subject Right: And therefore an Ordinance that shal stand (mauger al the malice of men) as a pretious Ordi-

nance of Jesus Christ so long as the Sun & Moon endures. And therefore instead of your appealing to men, since there hath been enough said, If you and I had never written, let us appeal to God; and let all those that own their childrens right in the Covenant say, *Amen*.

In *Page* 25. he concludes again, that Infant Baptism is corrupt in the four Essentialls aforementioned.

Answ: First then by his own words, tis not annihilated, but onely Corrupted, and that a person though corruptly Baptiz'd, ought not to be Baptiz'd, hath been already prooved. But,

Secondly, He reckons without his host, and therefore must come to a new accompt: They are not Essentialls, nor any of them, as laid down by him, but whimsies of his own brain; therefore.

The next thing we are to follow him in is the business of the Covenants, with its distinctions and extent; from which he undertakes to prove, that Infants are not subjects of Baptism. Though we have hitherto built upon a good Foundation; yet if hee shakes down this main pillar, it will be time to forsake the house. But before wee can come to his Arguments, we must passe by many falsities and prolocutions, and goe through many impertinencies, which must be born withall amongst the Patrons of Error. The first thing he deals with is, A (pretended) false consequence, which he saith, wee draw from scripture, to maintain Infant-Baptism: It runs thus, 'The Covenant 'of Grace is made with beleevers, and their seed: Therefore the seale 'of the Covenant belongs to them. To disprove which he tells us, ''tis against the Law of the new Testament.

Answ. The new Testament is Christs last will to his Church; in which hee shews forth more love then he did in his first Testament, which was made to the same Church: and the Covenant of Grace, in the spirituall part thereof, is the same in both: If therefore in the old Testament, which was his first Legacie, hee took Children into his kingdom, and yet now, his bowels should be shut against them who are not then called into libertie, but a greater bondage then before. But grace in the Covenant being unchangeable, therefore Children still remain within Christs kingdom, except our opposits can shew us how, when, and where they were out-law'd.

Secondly, His insisting upon the Command, *Matth.* 28. *Go teach and Baptize*, doth not at al cross this consequence, as hath been already proved; therefore no consequence of ours is forc'd to oppose the new Testament.

Thirdly, But such without which his practice is not Gospell, because

because it shuts up the tender bowels of our Lord Jesus in a narrower compass then ever the Law did, and the fancies and burthens, Master *Patient* would put upon our shouldiers, in that which they call the Ordinance, would be heavier then ever the Loyns of the Law were; As to that Instance he brings of *Peter* in *Page* 26. to prove consequencies against commands unlawfull, because he would have disswaded Christ from suffering, in these words, *Far be it from thee Lord:*

Answ. Instead of handling the word like a Minister, he stretcheth the strings of Scripture, till they crack: what kind of consequence could this be, or from what place of Scripture, or against what command, was this a consequence to say, *Far be it from thee Lord?* Surely the most any *English* Grammarian can make from thence is; That it was a dissuasive, but no consequence. However, by this we may judg how feeble this mans Judgment is, when he thinks God hath Chosen him as one of those, that shall confound the wise of the world, that doth not yet understand what a true, or right consequence is.

'Master *Patient* afterwards tells us, that all such consequencies 'and books and arguments as are brought against commands (to 'prove Infant Baptism, which is cleerly implied) he may say of 'them, as Christ to *Peter*, *Get the behind mee Satan, thou art an offence 'to me. Page* 26. 27.

Answ. Alas poor man, if the Phylicks of truth offend his stomack, which should cure him; 'tis a sad signe hee is near past recovery. However, take this extract from his own Instance, that so far as any man shall disswade others from truth, and cause them to [illegible]ize from the ways of Christ, hee Acts the Divels part, *Ergo* This I say not; Get thee behind me Satan but this I say, that book by him published, in which he so bitterly reviles the good old way of God: for the ends aforesaid. The State would doe well to have all such books, though in Folio, put into an Index Expurgatorius, amongst the whole Rabble of Erroneous and Hereticall peeces, that have been printed in these Licentious book-days: and so condemn them to the fire, as they have done others not fit to be suffered. And by this meanes, all Protestant Churches through the world, will know, what Religion wee are of.

'In *Page* the 27 he pretends to come nearer the consequence, 'and grounds thereof, but doth not close till *Page* 28. And then hee 'tells us of the danger of the practice of Infant-Baptism, that if it 'be maintained in all it's dimensions upon the Ground of the Covenant it will shake the very foundation of the Gospell.

Answ. All these are but *great swelling words of vanitie*, fit for

nothing but to delude the simple, of which we have been long since foretold by the Apostles of Christ: but to the busines of the Covenant at last hee comes; where at length we shall find with what grosse ignorance, hee gropes about, to find a new way, but is mistaken.

CHAP. VII.

The two Covenants answered.

Page 28. In handling this consequence, and to cut off the interest of Children, and right to the Covenant, hee reduceth the method into these four heads, as before the Controversie of Baptism was into four Essentialls.

First, To prove there are two Covenants held forth in Scripture: a Covenant of Works, and a Covenant of Grace.

Secondly, That the Covenant of Circumcision was not of Grace, but works.

Thirdly, That none but beleevers ever had, or shall have a right to the Covenant of Grace.

Fourthly, To answer such objections and Scriptures as are usually alledged, to defend a Covenant of life in the flesh.

To prove the first of these, hee brings severall Scriptures: the main of which is, *Jer* 31. 32. 33 34. but to what purpose, it will afterward appear: the words are these. *Behold the days come, that I wil make a new Covenant with the house of Israel, & the house of Judah: Not according to the Covenant I made with their Fathers, when I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the Land of Egypt*; which my Covenant they brake, *though I was to them a husband, saith the Lord.* 'where saith Master *Patient*, we find an old Covenant, and a new 'Covenant: the old broken, therefore of works; the new was not like 'the old, therefore of Grace, *&c.*

Answ. Before I shall come to answer the Scriptures by him quoted, I shall briefely premise, what a Covenant of Grace is; The Answer will be this, *It's a gracious engagement betwixt God and his people upon Gospell terms, requiring duties from them, in promising mercy to them*: what that mercy and duties be, and how far Conditionall, shall largely appear in its due place: this definition of the Covenant, importing a Condition is often denied by our opposites, and sometimes

ſometimes Granted, ſo that to bee as a ſtable foundation to build upon, I thought it moſt fit for this place. And according to this definition, I ſhall doe two things:

Firſt, Give a brief Epitome or Analyſis of *Abrahams* Covenant.

Secondly, The whole enſuing diſcourſe, with all his Scriptures that he brings, will be from hence anſwered, and ſo his weapons brought againſt us, and many more added to them, ſhall be made uſe of, to prove *Abrahams* Covenant in every part thereof, to be a Covenant of pure Grace; which (I am ſure) as tis the beſt fortification I can make to ſecure the truth, ſo the incurſions that ſhall be made from hence, upon his confuſed and new doctrine, will give a rout thereto.

Abrahams Covenant had two parts, *Gen.* 17. 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14.

Firſt, Gods part: this conſiſted in bleſſings, carried on in a way of promiſe, and that twofold.

1. Inward and Spirituall; I will be thy God, and thy Seeds God: to give grace and Glory.
2. Outward and Temporall, ſpecially in three things.
   1. In multiplying his ſeed as the Stars.
   2. In making them bleſſings to families and Nations.
   3. In giving them the Land of *Canaan* for an everlaſting poſſeſſion.

Secondly, Mans part; and this reſpected duties to be done and that twofold.

1. Inward, *walke before mee, and be thou perfect.*
2. Outward, and this alſo in three things eſpecially.
   1. In keeping to the ſeale or token which then was (circumciſion, as now Baptiſm) therefore in every Generation.
   2. In keeping the Morall Law.
   3. All thoſe Typical ceremonies relating to Worſhip.

By all which we ſhall hereafter ſee,

1. That here are not two Covenants ſpoken of.
2. That the Covenant of Grace is Conditional.

Firſt it hath Gods part, and that conſiſts of promiſes and bleſſings, Spiritual and Temporal. Secondly mans part conſiſting of duties, inward and outward, and all this but one Covenant. This Covenant was confirmed, Firſt to *Abraham* as a publique Father: Secondly to his ſeed, *i. e.* all the heirs of promiſe to the worlds end, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*.

1. By Promise.
2. By Oath.
3. By seale.

So that what was promised to *Abraham*, was promised to al his seed, and what was sworn and seald to *Abraham*, was sworn and seald to all his seed. According to this definition also we shall see a twofold admission into Covenant.

1. Into the outward priviledges of the Covenant.
2. Into the inward grace of the Covenant.

Hence also we shall have light to see, first, how hypocrites and wicked men did then, and do now, get within the Covenant; Secondly how such as are within the Covenant do break it, As first hee that contemned or slighted, or neglected the token or seale of the Covenant to his seed, hath broken the Covenant, which being outward they might keep.

Secondly, The breach of any part of the Morall Law, was a breach of the Covenant, and this also might have been externally kept by all, that were externally within the Covenant.

Thirdly, All those typicall Church rites might have been kept, and the neglect or breach of any one in the due order or manner required, was a breach of the Covenant: for neglect of the first, Gods wrath was so kindled against *Moses*, that he would have kild him; for breach of the second and third *Israel* was also punisht with death: many instances thereof might be given. Hence also we shall be led to an answere how the Covenant is call'd.

1. Old and so vanisht away.
2. New and so remaines.
3. An administration.

This being briefly premised, I now come to give in the Answer to the place by him quoted, *Jer.* 31. 32. which he brings to prove that there are two Covenants, but grossely mistaken; yet so far as we may goe without breach of faith to the truth of Christ, in acknowledging two Covenants, I shall not deny him friendship, as namely,

First, That there hath been two Covenants made with man: the one of workes before the fall, in which man stood alone without a mediator, under which covenant al mankind by nature lies to this day, which is also materially the same with that righteous Law Morall, given to *Israel* from mount *Sinah*, though upon other tearmes.

Secondly, The other of Grace made since the fall, and tendred to *Adam*, in the promise of Christ, since which, the Law in any part of it,

it, is not given as a covenant of workes, but as the Law of Christ put in the hands of a mediator, therefore,

Thirdly, It was never intended by God, either in giving circumcision to *Abraham*, or the Law to *Israel*, that ever *Abrahams* seed should enjoy *Canaan*, by the law as a Covenant of works, but only (as hath been laid down in the *Analysis*) as mans part, of the covenant of grace.

Quest. But if that was not a covenant of works given to *Israel*, when God took them by the hand, in order to bring them into *Canaan*, what then can be the meaning of that place, where the holy Ghost speaks of, an old & new Covenant? & tells us the new Covenant which he will make after those days, shall not be according to the old, &c.

The clearing of this, with a Question or two more, will take in all those scriptures brought to this, and therefore I further answer.

First, The Covenant there mentioned is call'd *new*, as the *Law* of love, *Iohn* 13. 34. 1 *Iohn* 2. 8. is call'd *a new Commandment or Law*; which yet is not new in it self, but the same Command as was given to *Israel* of old *Lev.* 19. 18 And as the new heavens and new earth are call'd new *Re.* 21. 1. And as the new Creature is call'd new, which is not the annihilating the old, and creating new, but the putting of the old heavens and old earth, into a new frame of Government, and the old creature into a new state of grace, so the new Covenant is the same that brought *Israel* out of *Egypt*, and contained remission of sins, and eternall life in Christ by faith with all the blessings of this life, but so call'd, new,

Secondly, Because those typicall ceremonies and ordinances which were mans part of the Covenant of grace then, and related to his dutie in Gods worship, were by Christs coming abolisht, and new ordinances under the Gospell establisht in room thereof, for the promising part of the Covenant of grace, from the beginning, hath ever been cloathed, with the preceptive Conditional part, to bind up man to his dutie, and walking close with God in his Ordinances of worship. And therefore when Christ was held forth in the first promise, immediatly sacrifices were instituted, a distinction made betwixt clean and unclean creatures, the Law of tithes and first fruits observed, blood forbidden: familie-duties required, all which a diligent reader of Scriptures, may easily observe, from *Adam* to *Moses*, before there was a publishing the Law from *Sinay*, and so to Christ, Track it from Christ again, to the worlds end, you have the first abolisht, a second instituted, and as then, so still; to bind man to his dutie in walking with

with God, but not as in a distinct Covenant of works, but as the terms of grace, to which man is bound by the Covenant: and thus those typicall ceremonies were as old clothes, and are called beggerly Rudiments or Rags, in which the promising part was clothed, and dreſt. The Apoſtle in *Heb.* 10. calls the exhibition of Chriſt in fleſh, in offering up his blood by once dying, and ſuch manner of inſtitutions as ſhould be written by him, to be the *new Covenant verſe* 15. 16. and puts it in oppoſition to the Legall ſacrifices *verſe* 4. 5, therefore *verſe* 19, 20. the ſecond is *called the new and living way conſecrated*, implying, that as there is now a way to heaven conſecrated by the blood of Chriſt, and therefore new; ſo there was a way to heaven before Chriſt came, conſecrated by the *blood of Bulls and Goats, called* old: by this then we ſee, in what reſpect the Covenant is called new and old, namely, as relating to a new or old *Church-ſtate*, the firſt given as typicall by *Moſes* to *Iſrael*, as Chriſts kingdom; the ſecond as ſubſtantiall, by Chriſt to the ſame kingdom; but ſtill in the ſame Covenant of grace: for a Church ſtate is given in order to a ſoules enjoying, communion with God in his ordinances, which is impoſſible to be by a Covenant of works, ſince the fall; thus then, the bringing of *Iſrael* into a new Church-ſtate, under the Goſpell, is called a new Covenant, which God will make with the houſe of *Iſrael* in thoſe daies: This gives us light, to anſwer alſo that other place *Heb.* 8. 6, 7. by Maſter *Patient* quoted to prove two Covenants, *becauſe Chriſt is called the Mediator of a better Covenant eſtabliſht upon better promiſes: for if the firſt Teſtament had been faultleſs, there would have been no place ſought for the ſecond; but finding fault with them, hee ſaith, behold the day is come, when I will make a new Covenant with the houſe of* Iſrael, *and* verſe 13. *In that he ſaith, a new Covenant, he hath made the firſt old: now that which waxeth old, is ready to vaniſh away.* By which tearms old and new, firſt and ſecond, better and worſe, he would needs underſtand two Covenants; one of works, the other of Grace.

Anſw. In this 8 *Chap.* the Apoſtle comes to apply what he had treated of before in the former *Chap. verſe* 1 *now of the things which we have ſpoken this is the ſumme.* In the former *Chapter* the Apoſtle had been ſpeaking of the Levitical Prieſthood and Law, *i. e.* the Law of Ordinances, and therefore *verſe* 18. he tells us, *the Commandement* going before, *i. e.* before Chriſt came, was diſannull'd, becauſe of the weakneſs, and *unprofitableneſs* of it, and gives the reaſon in *verſe* 19 *becauſe the Law, i. e. the Law of ceremonies made nothing perfect*

in

in comparison, but the bringing in of a better hope did, by which we draw nigh to God, by which he means the Gospel-Ordinances of worship; called better, because opposed to the Ceremonies of the Law, which therefore are implyed to be wrote. And that by this *better hope*, is meant Gospel-Ordinances, is evident; because the Apostle useth it as an Argument to the Church of the *Hebrews*, to perswade them to hold fast their profession, which they were revolting from; telling them, If they should cast off the Ordinances of worship, they could not then draw nigh to God; because they would then cast off also the High-Priesthood of Christ; so ch. 3.6. *Whose house are we if we hold fast the rejoycing of the hope to the end.* And ver. 14. *We are made partakers of Christ if we hold fast the confidence to the end*; He here calls that the *confidence*, which before he called the *Hope and Confidence*, and ch. 10.35. *Cast not away therefore your Confidence*, As if he had said, If you cast away the Ordinances, of worship, you stand no longer related to Christ as his house; nor have you any hope or ground of hope, to draw nigh to God. So ch. 7. 19. *the Law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by which we draw nigh to God:* So that the Ordinances of drawing nigh to God under the Gospel, are called a better hope, as they stand opposed to the Ordinances of worship under the Law: which albeit they did approach to God in them; yet they were kept thereby at a greater distance, *ch.* 9.6,7,8,9. So ——

Again, let us review this chapter further, because the cleering up of chap. 8. depends upon it. And these Scriptures being fully answered, we shall not have much to do with the rest; we have already seen, that the Ordinances of the Gospel, are opposed to those of the Law. And that this is so, see v. 11. *If perfection was by the Levitical Priesthood, (For under it the people received the Law) what need was there of another Priesthood to rise after the order of* Melchizedek? What law was this the people received, *ver.* 12. 'Tis such a law as was changed upon the change of the Priesthood, which cannot be meant of the Moral Law, for this is still the same and not changed; but the *Law of the Altar*, which in *ver.* 16. is called *a carnal commandment*, which in *ver.* 18. *is disannulled by reason of the weakness of it*, and ver. 19. *for the Law made nothing perfect*, and the reason is given *ch.* 9.9. *Because it was a figure for the time present, in which were offered gifts and Sacrifices that could not make him that did it perfect*: And ch. 10.1. *The Law being but a shadow of good things to come, can never with those Sacrifices which they continually offered, make the comers thereto perfect;*

for then they would not have ceased: and in *ver.* 8. when he speaks of Christ coming to be offered, he draws this result from the premisses; *he takes away the first that he may establish the second.*

Now in this 8 chapter he draws towards a conclusion, and in the first verse: of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum: he had before spoken of the Law of Ordinances, and weakness thereof; and therefore in this 7. *v.* of *c.* 8. he calls it the first Covenant, *for if the first Covenant had been faultless.* Why, wherein was it faulty? The Apostle had before told them, it was faulty because it was weak, and unprofitable: and had it not been so, that law of Ordinances would have made the worshippers perfect; And then no place would have been sought for the second Covenant. So then by the first Covenant 'tis cleer is meant the Ordinances of the Ceremonial worship, *and therefore finding fault with them*, he speaks in the plural number [*them*] Ordinances, not Covenants, *ver.* 8. (unless Mr. *Patient* will make two Covenants of works then) *he saith, behold the day is come when I will make a new Covenant*, referring to *Jer* 31.32. *with the house of Israel* i.e. new laws of worship. *Not according to the Covenant I made with their Fathers*, &c. And verse last, *in that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old*, &c. And therefore whereas Mr. *P.* tells us that God gave *Israel* a Covenant of works to enjoy *Canaan* by; It is most absurd: as by their following particulars further appears.

1. Had those typical Ordinances been a Covenant of Works given at Mount-*Sinai* to *Israel*, then it had not been put in the hands of a Mediator. For where God gives a people a *Mediator*, is supposed, he intends them Grace thereby. When *Adam* was put into a Covenant of Works, he was left to stand or fall by himself without help; since that no Covenant of Works was ever made, *Gal.* 4. *Moses* is called the Mediator of the first Testament. Now a Will or a Testament is an act of Grace purely.

2. Had it been a Covenant of Works by which they were to possess *Canaan*, there had not been one man that ever had entred into that rest. For it was impossible for them to fulfil it, because the power of doing, so as to answer a Covenant of works, was lost in the fall.

3. What favour had this been to *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and so to all the seed of Promise, to have such a flourishing promise, to possess such a fruitful Land by a Covenant of Works, when many of the Nations of the world did possess a more fruitful Country, and were never

ver put to such labour and toyle, such difficulties and dangers that *Israel* were put to?

4. 'Tis against the Nature of a Covenant of Grace which God made with *Abraham*, first to put him into a Covenant of Grace for spirituals, and then twenty four yeers after should put him into a Covenant of Works for Temporals. So that either believers must fall from Grace, or else stand under two Covenants at one time.

5. Had it been a Covenant of Works made with *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and so along, as this Author affirms, then how came the bond-womans son a type of that Covenant, to be exempted from that Covenant of Works, and *Isaac* which was *Sarahs* son, a type of the Covenant of Grace, and a child of Promise, to be put under that Covenant? It could not be for any outward distinction, in outward enjoyments, for *Ishmael* had more of the glory of the world then *Isaac*, Gen. 17.21.

6. Had the mercy intended *Israel*, related onely to externals in giving them a fruitful Country, in blessing their corn, wine, and oyle, the fruit of their bodies, their basket, and store, as Mr. *Patient* affirms, and this to be enjoyed by a Covenant of Works; then as a worthy Divine well observes, in somewhat the like case, how could *Esau* have been charged for a prophane person, for selling his birth-right? For there had been no prophaneness in that, because prophaneness supposeth a contempt or neglect of something spiritual, which is therfore to be enjoyed upon a spiritual account, and not by works.

7. What the Prophet speaks, *Jer.* 31.22. and the Apostle *Heb.* 8. 9. *of Gods taking Israel by the hand to bring them out of* [illegible], is by the Prophet, *Hos.* 11.4. interpreted, compared with *Mat.* 2.15. to be an act of a tender Father who owned *Israel* as a son; for as a father in tender love and respect to his young child, takes him by the hand to teach him to go; so did God deal with *Israel* when a child. The like he did to *Ephraim* ver. 3. *I taught Ephraim* also *to go, taking him by the hand*: so when he destroyed *Sodom*, Gen. 19.16. Whilst *Lot* lingered as being unwilling to leave *Sodom* the Text saith, *he laid hold upon his hand and brought him forth.* And the reason is given, because *the Lord was merciful to them.* So that what God did to his people in this kind (is most cleer) was from a pure Covenant of Grace, and Mercie, not by a Covenant of Works.

8. What God did to *Israel* in giving them rest in *Canaan*, was as *Canaan* was a Type of Heaven, *Isa* 65.9. and of the Churches state under the New-Testament, *Jer.* 3.18. *Psal.* 105.6. For so the promise of *Abraham*, in giving them *Canaan* is by the Prophet *David* inter-

terpreted to be, to a thousand generations, which therefore must needs extend to the end of the world. For so 'tis called a Covenant for ever. And had his seed injoyed *Canaan* from *Abrahams* days, yet from thence to Christ was but forty two generations, *Mat.* 1. So that if *Canaan* was to be possest as a type of heaven, then it was not to be possest by a Covenant of works, but by faith, so *Abraham* possest it, *Heb.*11.8,9,10. *By Faith he sojourned in the Land of promise as in a strange Country, dwelling in Tabernacles with Isaac, and Jacob; heirs with him of the same Promise. For he looked for a City which had foundations, whose builder and maker was God.* And ver.15,16. *he sought a better Country*, a Country whereof that was but a type. Now what promise were *Isaac* and *Jacob* heirs of? Why that of the Covenant of Grace, *Gen.*17.8. *To thee will I give the Land of Canaan.* And this the Apostle tells us was possest by Faith as a type of heaven; therefore not by a Covenant of Works.

9. It further appears by comparing, *Gen.*17.7. *I will be thy God*, with *Heb.*11.16. *Wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he hath prepared for them a City*, Where the Apostle thus argues, that had the great promise to *Abraham*, been onely of an earthly *Canaan*; which this Author affirms, was to be enjoyed by a Covenant of Works; God would have been ashamed to be called his God; 'tis evident therefore, that for men to affirm such Doctrines as this, is to put an affront upon God himself.

10. It still further appears, that *Abrahams* seed injoyed *Canaan* by a Covenant of Grace; because what *Moses* and *Joshua* did, who were their conductors, was done by faith, and 'tis also applyed to all *Israel*, *Heb.*11. 27,28,29, *By faith*, he forsook *Egypt*, *by faith he kept the passeover*, *by faith they past through the red Sea* So when *Joshua* led them over *Jordan* it was an act of faith; yea the very conquest of the enemy there, was an act of Faith, *ver.* 30. therefore, for him to affirm that first Covenant, before largely opened, to be those typical ceremonies; and so mans part of the Covenant of Grace, to be a Covenant of Works, by which they were to live happily in *Canaan*, is such notorious stuffe that he might blush to name it.

11. Such a doctrine directly opposeth these Scriptures, *Deut.*9.4, 5,6,7,8 *speak not thou in thy heart, saying, for my righteousness the Lord hath brought me in to possess this Land*, and ver.5. *not for thy righteousness, dost thou possess this Land*, And ver. 6. *not for thy righteousness for thou art a stiff-necked people*, and ver.7, *forget not how thou provokedst the Lord to wrath in the wilderness, and from the day that*

that ye came out of Egypt even to this day, until ye came to this place, ye have been rebellious against the Lord, and ver. 27. he refers back to *Abrahams* Covenant, and makes use of it as an argument to prevail with God in Prayer; because he had promised to give them *Canaan* by grace, and not by their works, so also *ch.* 10. 11, 12, 13, 16. *Exod.* 2. 24. *ch.* 3. 6. 8. and *ch.* 6. 8. *Numb.* 14. 23.

12. That rest the Apostle speaks of *Heb.* 4. 1. is meant of a like rest to that of *Canaan*, which *Israel* was cut short off for want of faith, *Heb.* 3. 18. *to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest; but to them that believed not*? this promise of rest is by the Apostle called a preaching the Gospel, *Heb.* 4. 2. *For unto us was the Gospel preached as well as unto them*; implying clearly, that what was spoken in that promise of giving *Israel* rest in *Canaan* was a preaching the Gospel to them. So that as the spiritual part of the Covenant, which conveys justification by Faith, is by *Paul* called a Gospel preaching, *Gal.* 3. 8. So the temporal part of the same Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 8. which this Author would fain make a Covenant of works, thereby to maintain his errors, the same Apostle tells us it was a Gospel preaching also. By what therefore hath been said hitherto, tis a shining truth, that *Abrahams* Covenant in all parts thereof, relating to spirituals, and temporals, was a full and compleat Covenant of Grace, to which circumcision was annexed, as a seal, not as a distinct Covenant of works, in order to the possessing of *Canaan*; because as hath been proved, by these twelve considerations, as there hath been no Covenant of works, given since the fall, so *Israel* injoyed *Canaan* by a Covenant of Grace; it follows therefore that Circumcision, and all those legal Ordinances, called the first Covenant, was no Covenant of works, but that part of the Covenant of Grace that related to mans duty; therefore *Gen.* 17. 14. tis called *Gods Covenant*, and the neglect of mans duty in that Covenant was a breach thereof.

Q. But if that place *Jer.* 31. 32. with *Heb.* 8. 6, 7. be to be understood of a Covenant of Grace, and not of works; then how may it be said that *Israel* brake that Covenant? Can a Covenant of Grace be broken?

The Answer to this, upon what is laid down in the Analysis of *Abrahams* Covenant, is plain, for there is no Covenant of Grace but hath Conditions, which bind man to his duty: it was so under the Law: faith and repentance was the condition of the Covenant then, as tis now: and because faith without works is dead, being alone, *Jam.* 2. 17. therefore God hath given Ordinances, and the Laws Moral to his people to keep faith alive, and man may break his part of the Covenant;

Covenant; so it was with *Israel*, *Rom.* 4. when the Question was put, *What advantage then hath the Jew? Much every way, because to them, as to all Israel, was committed the Oracles, and the Covenant*, &c.

Here was the Covenant of Grace externally administred to all: but yet there was but a remnant saved, and the greatest part of *Israel* were Covenant-breakers; and the like we have now, and is, and must be acknowledged by all our dissenting friends of the dipt Societies, an external, and internal administration of the Covenant: For their confidence is not so high as to say, that all they dip are really within the Covenant, for we see many of them turn Apostates from every thing that is good, and prove carnal wretches; as did *Simon Magus*, *Judas*, *Hymeneus*, *Philetus*, *Ananias*, and *Saphira*, who were all within the Covenant visibly. If they say they baptize not upon the account of the Covenant at all, but upon the profession of Faith; I answer, either they baptize as visible believers, or real: if visible, then as visibly within the Covenant; if as real, then really within the Covenant: so that still the Covenant lies at bottom, and there is as much falling from Grace, and bresch of the Covenant upon their own principles, as is pleaded for. The like answer also is to be given to that other clause, of Gods being a husband to them. for the whole Nation of *Israel* was ingaged to God as a spouse, *Jer.* 3.14. and so under the Law of marriage; and therefore when they were divorced, the whole Nation was cast off; yet one of a City and two of a family were taken to *Zion*, I such as were spiritually within the Covenant, they had still communion with God, *v* 14. so now, the whole Church is visibly under a Covenant of Marriage to Christ, believers and their seed, and are therefore the children of the kingdom, but yet we know the greatest part of a Church may be hypocrites, and so the children of the kingdom may be cast out: so that it is most clear, a Covenant of Grace in this sense may be broken in the visible part thereof, by the visible members of it.

P: The next I find his piece driving at, is to prove the Covenant of Grace not to be made upon conditions, but absolute: to prove it, he takes up many pages, though to little purpose; for what he in one place denyes, in another place he affirms; as in pag. 35. where he confesseth Faith and Repentance the condition of the Covenant.

Answ. If it be the condition of the covenant, then the covenant is not made without conditions. For indeed to speak of a covenant absolute without conditions, is to speak of that, which cannot be; for if it hath no conditions, it is no covenant, but only a tender of grace:

And

And here lyes much of Mr. *Patients* great mistake, to take the tender of Grace for the covenant; and thus he falls into the Antinomian Doctrine: and therefore as faith and repentance is the condition, so the covenant is not concluded, betwixt God and the soul, till those qualifications are wrought, therefore the veins of free-grace are full of riches, because as God tenders, so he gives secretly the qualifications that lay hold upon the tender, so he did to our first Parents.

2. But besides, if the covenant hath no conditions, why then doth not Mr. *Patient* baptize all that come, but they must give such a strict account of their faith as before he speaks of? or why are any cast out that prove rotten? will they make conditions themselves, when God hath made none? For the very ground of administring all Ordinances, is from the covenant as it is conditional: and if it be not conditional, then is it made with a drunkard, as a drunkard; and with a whoremaster, as a whoremaster; with a blasphemer and Sabbath-breaker as such: and then to no purpose is that of *Paul* 2 *Cor.* 6.14,15. *What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, light with darkness, Christ and Belial together*? that place *Jer.*32. 40. had such conditions as God requires. *For his fear was wrought in their hearts, that they should not depart from him:* the like also *Ezek.*16.59. *Thus saith the Lord, I will even deal with thee as thou hast done*, which hast despised the oath in breaking the covenant: and because he afterward speaks of my covenant & thy covenant, therfore M *P.* concludes, here were two covenants; the one broken which was mans, the other kept which was Gods. But in this also there was but one covenant, which had two parts, Gods part and mans, which was their manner of covenanting with God to make an oath to walk in his ways: and when they had broken this oath; they had broken the covenant, second their part of the covenant: see that place also, *Neh.* 10.29. *They entred into a curse to walk in the laws of God, that were given by Moses the servant of the Lord*; The Law given was the terms God bound them to in a way of Grace and Mercy, and their oath or curse, declared their owning thereof; so that when the oath was broken, the covenant was broken; therefore the deduction that Mr. *Patient* makes from these Texts, that there are two covenants, is unsound and rotten, and savours of too ignorant a spirit in the covenant of Grace. The like also *Ezek.* 36.25,26,27. I will sprinkle clean water upon you, *I will take away the heart of stone, and give you a heart of flesh, &c.* And ver.37. *I will yet for all this be enquired of by the house of Israel*; is not here a condition? whereas therefore Mr.

Patient

Patient tells us if Gods people sin. 'He binds himself to pardon 'their sins, and to remember their sins no more; and therefore it is 'impossible for a soul once in this covenant to miscarry.

Answ. Such an application as this, is fitter for a Synagogue of Libertines then a Church of Christ, God never pardons the sin of a people, but he makes them holy. And before he pardons their sin he will make them smart, and cry out under the stroke of his hand; how did *David* roar under the wrath of the Almighty? the whole book of *Psalms* shews us; so *Heman*, and *Ephraim*, *Manasses*, yea all the examples in Gods word, and the experiences of Gods people, they all speak out the truth, *Heb.*7.2. that Christ is first *a King of righteousnes*, before a King of Peace.

Therefore let such as fear the Lord remember the covenant of grace hath conditions, such as God will whip his people into; and if the Rod will not do, his shepherds crook shall be laid on with strong blows: by this way had *David* comfort, *Psal.*23. And therefore tells us, *Psal.*89.37. *If Gods people sin, and transgress his Law, he will visit their transgressions with a rod, and their iniquities with stripes*; and though everlasting love is their portion, yet that is the way he takes to breed them up, to bring them to covenant conditions: And though the Elect of God shall never finally fall away; yet they may and do break and fall from the visible part of the covenant too often, though they are brought in again; and others fall off finally, as did those primitive Apostates already mentioned. So that place must be understood, *Joh.*15.2,4.5,6. which distinction Mr *Patient* must admit of, and can never evade it.

All the rest of those scriptures by him brought to prove the absoluteness, or sureness of the covenant, or two covenants, do bear the same interpretation; take those two for instance, *Isaiah* 55.3. hearken to me *incline your ear, hear and your soul shall live*: *and I will make an everlasting covenant*. &c. So Heb. 6.17, 18. *wherein God willing to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel confirmed the same by oath to Abraham*; *that by two immutable things in which it was impossible for God to lye*: *We might have strong consolation*: And though Mr *Patient* from these places concludes, the covenant-mercy of *David* to be sure, and so immutable; yet there must be an inclining the ear, and hearkening to the voice of God: even of such as are really within the covenant; and to such onely the covenant is sure: But now there were many of the Church of the Hebrews that we have ground to judge were but visibly in covenant, and

so,

so, onely pretended heirs of promise, and such were they that wer falling from Ordinances that forsook the assemblies; sold their birthright, as those also already mentioned: So that we still see the distinction holds, some are really, some onely visibly, seemingly within the covenant.

P. Pa. 24 He afterwards brings many places to prove, that the condition of the covenant (which before he denyed) is faith and repentance, and they are wrought in the soul by God.

Answ. That the condition of the covenant is so wrought, is by us confest, but yet we may here see how whiffling erroneous spirits are: sometimes he affirms the covenant to be absolute, sometimes that it is conditional, that so he might have a starting hole to flye out at: and let me remind him here; that if he keeps to this principle, that faith and repentance is the condition of the covenant; he must according to the Scriptures, admit of a visible being in the covenant, as well as of an invisible, in order to the communion of Saints in the world; for there are many pretenders to those conditions and qualifications, which yet by vertue of their profession cannot be denyed the seals of the covenant, because they visibly submit to the terms thereof, as is before proved.

P. The next thing he grosly errs in, is page 37, where in his explaining that Text, *Gen.* 3. 17. of the seed of the woman, he tells us it is meant of Christ; That God would infuse or put into the womans seed, his created gifts of holiness and purity.

Answ. We may see what old Springs of error this book of his bubbles up withal. For by this he makes Christ only a compleat and perfect man, as *Adam* before the fall, with infused qualifications, and by this made an unspotted Sacrifice; by which, the divine nature of Christ is taken away, that he was not God as well as man: and the Hypostatical union (as Divines call it) is by this destroyed, contrary to the whole current of Gods word; and directly opposing *Joh.* 1. 1,2,3,10,14. *And the word was made flesh, and dwelt among st us ver.* 18. So *Heb.* 1. 2,3. 1 *Joh.* 4. 14,15. *ch.* 5. 1,7,10,11. multitudes of Texts might be added. *Arius* thy error struggles to live, when thou art dead.

2. When God saith, I will put enmity betwixt thy seed and her seed we are not to understand it meerly of Christ, but of the Infant-Church seed. For so *Eve* by faith understood the promise, *Gen.* 4. 5. when *Seth* was born, *God hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel whom Cain slew.* Which Infant-seed of the Church is as truely in covenant,

was, and shall be to the worlds end, as Adult believers, and Satans malice is as much against them, as the other, in all ages, as appears by *Cains* bloody Murther, with *Exod.* 1.10,16. *Mat.* 2.16. *Rev.* 12.2. 13.17. Therefore Mr *Patient* in his often endeavours to cast out this seed of the Church by confining the Church, either to Christ personally, or Adult believers, which so often he calls the spiritual seed, doth but strive to do that now, which if he will but read those places cited, He may know who it was that studyed the same practice in former ages.

P. The 28 page, tells us that the new covenant was never entailed upon any fleshly line or generation as the covenant of circumcision was, but was still confirmed of God in Christ, and to such onely in Christ as you finde in the promises to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 12.3. *In thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed.* In which there is no respect of persons in their blessings to life, but all Nations in Christ, as well one as another are blest, and all out of Christ are accurst.

Answ. It hath been before proved that the new covenant or covenant of grace, hath a twofold part or branch, the one invisible, the other visible, and both are the covenant. The one relates to the grace of the covenant, the other to mans duty in the use of Ordinances. And this second part, hath from the beginning run upon intail to believers and their seed; even from the days of *Adam* to Christ, and so since; yea the promise which relates to the spiritual seed, runs for the most part upon intail also, though I do not say that all the seed of believers are so children of the promise. For as the intail visibly took in all the seed of *Abraham*, *Ishmael* as well as *Isaac*, so *Esau* as well as *Jacob*, *Cain*, as well as *Abel*, *Ham* and *Japhet* as well as *Shem*, yet the seed by promise comes in by way of intayl, to the children of promise. As the covenant was entayled from *Adam* to *Seth*, *Enos*, *Kenan*, so to *Noah*, *Shem*, *Arphaxad*, and up to *Abraham*; and then to *Isaac*, *Jacob*, and his twelve sons, but so in *Judah* it continued to Christ, see *Luke* 3. to the end, compared with *Mat.* 1. to 17. where you shall finde a spiritual entail by promise, and were it not so, what incouragement could it be to believers to be Stoickt in family duties, had they not a promise to rest upon, as touching family blessings? Which place in *Luke* 3. is so cleer that Mr *Patient* to evade the strength and dint of Scripture, makes this whole line to run in a covenant of works: the contrary whereto is already proved that no such covenant is made with man since the fall; therefore see these Texts which prove an intail, *Deut.* 4.37. *Because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them*, So *ch.* 10.5. *the Lord had*

had a delight in thy Fathers to love them, and he chose their seed after them, even you above all people, compared with *Rom* 11.28. *as touching the Election they are beloved for their fathers sake* *: Hence it is that we finde the Parents faith drawn forth to believe their seeds interest in the covenant. Thus did *Eve* in the place before mentioned, believe the covenant-state of *Seth*, as soon as born. And therefore she calls him another seed instead of *Abel*. The like also we find of *Lamech*, Gen 5.28,29. who concludes that though God would destroy and curse the earth; yet upon the birth of *Noah*, he should be a comfort to the Church: Thus was *David* drawn forth to believe. That because of that *Everlasting Covenant* God had made with him, he should in time *have his house to flourish, though yet God made it not to grow*, Psal.89.29,34,35 compared with 2 *Sam.*23.5. The like ground of believing is to reach to these days, and to the worlds end concerning the seed of believers right to the covenant, as *Psal* 102.28. *the children of thy servants shall continue, and their seed shall be established before thee*; How long was this seed to continue? See *ver* 26,27: So long as heaven and earth should remain. Hence it is that God hath promised, *to be the God of all the families of Israel*, Jer.31.1. & Isa.65.23. *That they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord and their off spring with them.* Which blessedness relates to more then externals, as by that 102 *Psal.* appears. For the heaven and earth was to be folded up as a garment and to wax old; *but the seed and off-spring of his children should remain, and have greater blessings.*

* Deut. 30.19. *Therefore chuse life that both thou and thy seed may live.*

That place *Gen.*12.3. Mr *Patient* doth acknowledge to be Gospel, but in such low and general terms, that in effect he denyes it; For saith he, all Nations that are in Christ are blessed. When yet, he will not acknowledge that ever any Nation were so blest, no not the Jews themselves; but onely a remnant. And the reason of his misteke is, because he considers not that there is a visible being in Christ, as in that place, *Joh.*15.4. *Abide in me and I in you; he that abideth not in me is cut off as a branch*: So that he confines the meaning of the promise, *in thee and in thy seed*, to Christ onely; contrary to the due sense of the words. For by *thy seed* is also meant believers, and so Christ mystically in head & members is to be understood. *Gen* 13.5. *look towards heaven and tell the stars if thou art able, so shall thy seed be*: Mr *Patient* I hope will not make so many Christs, and *ch.*17.7. *I will establish my covenant betwixt me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations*; so if *Abraham* had a seed in every generation which were to be a blessing thereto: So *Gen.*12.17. *In blessing I will bless*

thee, and will multiply thy seed, and thy seed shall possess the gates of his enemies, meaning the conquest of *Canaan* which could not be in Christ personal, because the Land of *Canaan* was conquered many hundred yeers before he came, and since tis destroyd. *So in thy seed all the Nations of the earth shall be blessed*, ver 8. *i. e.* in the multiplying of *Abrahams* seed as the stars, they should at last come to be a blessing to all Nations; by all which places it is cleer that the word *seed* which he confines to Christ, is meant of all believers to the worlds end: and indeed to deny this sense of the place, is to deny that *Abraham* had any Gospel preacht to him, as any judicious reader may easily observe; for that which the Apostle *Rom.* 3.18. speaks of *Abrahams* faith to justification, is referred to *Gen.* 15.5. *So shall thy seed be, that is, as the stars of heaven for multitude*, which *Abraham* believing, *it was imputed to him for righteousness*; This Exposition therefore being granted, the other will appear but lame and maimed.

3. The covenant saith Mr *Patient*, is not intailed as circumcision was.

Answ. Though there hath been enough said to satisfie men of reason, yet I shall here, as in many other places, be forced to repeat what before hath been spoken: If therefore Circumcision be not a covenant of works, then it must be the visible part of the covenant of Grace, and then it must run upon entail, as Mr *Patient* here grants; Therefore let the Reader observe it hath been already proved, The covenant had two parts; one for spirituals, the other for temporals, in giving *Israel* rest in *Canaan*, and all the good things thereof: the first part is proved to be Gospel from *Gal.* 3.8. and that the second also is Gospel; see *Heb.* 3.18. compared with *ch.* 4.1,2 *to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not*, speaking of the *rest* in *Canaan*, which *Israel* was cut short of in the wilderness. And *ch.* 4.1. *Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us, We also fall short, For unto us is the Gospel preached as well as to them.* From whence it is cleer that *Israel* never had rest in *Canaan* by works, but by grace; and therefore it follows, If *Israel* did not injoy *Canaan* by a covenant of works, and yet they did injoy it by the covenant of Circumcision, then Circumcision was not of works, but of grace: so that we see our opposites must be forced to acknowledge the visible part of the covenant of Grace to run upon intail to believers and their seed. Thus we have done with this first head, and have answered all his material Scriptures; which indeed doth also answer the next following, or any thing material in his book, and though I have undermined his foundation so, as that the whole

structure

ſtructure is fallen; yet becauſe I would ſeparate the ſtones, from the other rubbiſh, I ſhall therefore come to his next general head.

CHAP. VIII

An anſwer to the ſecond general head touching the Covenant.

PAg. 42. The next general head by him laid down to prove, is, That Circumciſion is no covenant of grace, but of works, called a covenant in the fleſh, *Gen.* 17. 13. but before he comes to his Arguments, he opens the meaning of the word *everlaſting*, which is to be underſtood of the *ever* of the Law, eſpecially when it comprehends with it their ſeed in their generations, and this he lays down as a maxim; to prove which, he brings *Lev.* 16. *Num.* 25. 13. *Exod.* 40. 15. *ch.* 30. 20. 21. all which places ſpeak of the Levitical Prieſthood, either of the line in which it ſhould run, or the way by which they were inſtated into their office, by anointing, or the manner by which they approacht conſtantly into the Tabernacle, or of the manner of their atonement for the people, all which ſhould remain as an everlaſting ſtatute in their generations.

A. That by everlaſting we are to underſtand the *ever* of the Law onely, is no ſound maxim: for though it be ſo to be underſtood in the places quoted, becauſe it related to the Prieſthood, and Tabernacle worſhip; yet if that covenant in *Gen.* 17. Which Circumciſion ſealed then, upon which God promiſed the Land of *Canaan* as a type of heaven, remains ſtill as an everlaſting covenant, then his maxim is broken: ſee therefore that parallel Text, *Pſal.* 105. 6 to *Gen.* 17. *O ye ſeed of Abraham his ſervant, he is the Lord our God, he hath remembred his covenant for ever, the word which he commanded to a thouſand generations, which covenant he made with Abraham and his oath with Iſaac, and confirmed the ſame to Jacob for a Law, and to Iſrael for an everlaſting covenant, ſaying, To thee will I give the Land of Canaan,* &c.

From which it appear, that the word everlaſting is to be underſtood to a thouſand generations, *i.e.* to the worlds end; becauſe the giving *Iſrael Canaan*, was a type of heaven, and from *Abrahams* days to Chriſt was but forty two Generations. Therefore this difference is to be obſerved; that when he ſpeaks of ſtatutes everlaſting to be obſerved

ſerved in their generations. 'Tis meant of thoſe Statute Laws, that God gave to *Iſrael* for worſhip; and ſo as Mr *Patient* obſerves it is to be underſtood for the *ever* of the Law. But when the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaks of a covenant, everlaſting, as in *Gen.* 17.15. 'Tis ſuch a covenant that is to continue ſo long as the heavens and earth ſhall continue, ſo *Paul* calls it, *Heb.* 13.20. The blood of the *everlaſting covenant*. And this in *Gal.*3.17. was that covenant that Chriſt confirmed to *Abraham* and his ſeed 430 yeers before the Law, and called everlaſting, in that place of *Geneſis* before quoted, which everlaſting covenant took in an everlaſting ſeed and is called a Goſpel-preaching to *Abraham*, Gal.3.8. and by *John*, Rev.14.6. is alſo explained to be an everlaſting Goſpel: from hence alſo it is that *Paul* in *Heb.*6. when he ſpeaks of God's bleſſing *Abraham* and multiplying *his ſeed*, which he calls the heir of promiſe, calls it his immutable Counſel, as relating to both the covenant, and the ſeed of the covenant. Now if there be an everlaſtingneſs in the covenant which takes in ſuch a ſeed as it did to *Abraham*, then muſt it continue longer then the Law, or elſe there muſt be a mutability. So again, if the perſons now covenanting were changed, *i. e.* If God were not the ſame to believers and their ſeed now, as he was then, or if believers ſhould now covenant onely for themſelves, and leave out their ſeed; then there is a mutation of the covenant: therefore *David* in *Pſal.* 102.26,27,28. before quoted, ſpeaking of the infant ſeed of the Church, tells us, *that though the heavens and earth ſhould wax old and periſh as a garment*, (which words are quoted by *Paul*, Heb. 1. 11. to a Goſpel-church) yet *that Church ſeed ſhould continue*, ſo alſo *Pſal.*103.17 18. *from everlaſting to everlaſting*, and that by vertue of that everlaſting covenant: therefore what feeble maxims this new Doctor teacheth, and how ill he compares Texts we may here ſee:

Pag 43. The next thing he opens is theſe words, *I will be thy God, and thy ſeeds God*, and that two ways; the one by a covenant of Grace, the other by a covenant of Works; the firſt abſolute, the ſecond conditional, and ſo God gave himſelf to be *Abrahams* God by a conditional covenant of Works.

A. That this is ſtrange Divinity, that God ſhould be a peoples God by a Covenant of Works ſince the fall, I doubt not but it will appear to ſound Chriſtians, from what hath been already ſaid: I ſhall therefore paſs it, to come to his confuſed Arguments, ſome of which I have contracted into form, to take the better proſpect thereof.

P. His firſt Argument runs thus. That covenant that runs upon conditions,

conditions, is a covenant of Works: but so doth Circumcision, therefore.

A. To which I answer, The first proposition is denyed and disproved, and it is by him confest that faith and repentance is a condition of the covenant. So that by this he affirms *pro* and *con.* and may as well say plainly, that the covenant of grace is a covenant of works, because it hath conditions: therefore his foundation is too weak, and rotten for such a building.

P. In pag. 45. he would prove the land of *Canaan* to be given to *Abraham* and his seed by a covenant of works, and so would be their God, and then his Argument runs thus. If God give the Land of *Canaan* to *Abraham* and his seed upon the condition of Circumcision, and keeping the Law; then he gave the land of *Canaan* by a covenant of works: but God gave the land to *Abraham* upon condition he would circumcise his seed; Therefore.

A. This hath been already cleared, that circumcision and keeping of the law was mans part of the covenant of Grace, in which the Church was to walk with God, being bound up to visible duties then, as it is now: and that *Canaan* was not given *Israel* by works, my answer to the preceding head makes clear, to which I refer the Reader, yea it is directly against these Scriptures before quoted, *Deut.* 9. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, *ch.* 10, 11, 12, 13, 16. *Exod.* 3. 24. *Heb.* 3. 18. *ch.* 4. 1, 2. *ch* 11. 8, 9, 10. yea so to affirm is to put an affront upon God himself, and to make him ashamed of that title of being *Abrahams* God, *Heb.* 11. 16. See also the twelve Scripture-considerations before mentioned.

P. In pag. 45, 46. he brings several Scriptures to prove that Circumcision bound to the keeping of the Law. But not one of all those places by him quoted, speaks that they were bound to keep it as a covenant of works, but as the *Law of Christ*, and so *Israels* Gospel, in which Justification was conveyed; and therefore when we read of the Primitive revoltings from Gospel-Ordinances, to Circumcision and the works of the law, as the Church at *Rome*, and *Galatia* did, it was upon the like mistake of this Author, who thought the law had been given them as a Covenant of works, which was not so intended, and by this means they came to rest in the law, and are condemned for it by the Apostle, *Rom.* 2. 13, 17. *Gal.* 5. 1, 2.

2. Consider, that Baptism now, binds as much to keep the law Moral and Gospel-Ordinances, as Circumcision then, did bind *Israel* to keep the same moral law, with the legal Ordinances; and he might

wich

with as much evidence of truth argue. That because Baptism binds to keep the law, therefore the Churches of Christ now are under a covenant of works.

P. page 47 he winds up thus: *Abraham*, as if God should say, I will be thy God, and thy seeds God, to protect, defend, deliver and bless thee; with the blessings of *Canaan*, in the fruit of the womb in thy basket and store, and with all outward blessings, upon condition that thou wilt be circumcised, and keep the law as a covenant of works.

A. A poor Argument, was it not? to prevail with *Abraham* when he might have replyed, Lord there are many that do possess a far greater portion in the world, yea thou hast said that my son *Ishmael* shall have twelve Princes rise from him, and that he shall be a great man in the earth, yet none of them are bound up to such strict obligations. And when thou gavest a covenant of works to *Adam*, he should have had Heaven, and eternal happiness and glory. And shall I be content with an earthly portion upon such hard terms? And upon this account it is, the Author to the *Hebrews* doth so argue: That God would have been ashamed to be called *Abrahams* God, which yet Mr *Patient* is not ashamed to tell the world in print that he was *Abrahams* God by a covenant of Works: —— Horrid stuffe: ——

The like answer is to be given to that place, *Jer.* 11.2,3,4,5. *cursed be the man that obeys not the words of this covenant which I commanded your Fathers, When I brought them from Egypt, saying, Obey my voice, so shall ye be my people, and I will be your God, that I may confirm the oath which I sware to your Fathers, to give them a land flowing with milk and honey*; the Land was given by grace, and the covenant he speaks of was a covenant of grace, not of works; but as faith leads to works, so the covenant leads man to his duty, in keeping the commands of God; it was so then, and so it is now, and in this sense, that place is true, *Psal. 6. he rewardeth every man according to his works, not for his works.* And we are at this day Gods people, and he our God upon the same terms of works, as then, See 2 *Cor.* 6.17, 18. *come out from amongst them, and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing, and then I will be your Father, and ye shall be my sons and daughters*, so that God becomes ours upon conditions still, and yet by no covenant of works.

P. Page 48. The last thing with which he concludes this first Argument (if such it be) is this. *Abraham* had a covenant of Grace

mead

made with him, twenty four yeers before that covenant of works, and his happineſs with all his ſpiritual ſeed was in that abſolute covenant.

A. Had M. *Patients* memory been good, he would not ſo have contradicted himſelf, For firſt, this covenant of works he hath made to begin from *Adam*, and ſo deſcended to *Abrakam*. For he hath long before proved that the Law which was given from *Sinai* was in force before the days of *Noah*, how then is that like to hold with this, that the covenant of works was not given to *Abraham*? tis twenty four yeers after that of Grace.

2 If he make Circumciſion the covenant of works, that he means: then it implyes that *Abraham* had two covenants of works; one by deſcent, and the other made afterwards.

3 Where he tells us, the happineſs of his ſpiritual ſeed lies in the abſolute covenant; I anſwer, what ſpiritual ſeed had *Abraham* if it was not *Iſaac*? And yet *Iſaac* was the line in which the covenant of Circumciſion was to run, and not *Iſhmael*, Gen 17. 21. So that look what happineſs the promiſe gave him of Gods being his God, was conveyed in that covenant: and either Mr *Patient* muſt ſay, it was no happineſs to him, to have God to be his God; or elſe if it was a happineſs: then he muſt acknowledge it in that covenant. Thus we ſee how ſadly he is be-error'd: certainly had this Doctrine been brought in the Apoſtles days, he would have lookt upon it as another Goſpel, and it is a ſad curſe that he gives to the preachers thereof.

P. A ſecond Argument, though very improperly ſo called, to prove circumciſion a covenant of works, is, becauſe it was a national covenant in the fleſh.

A. The prudent Reader may eaſily obſerve what a poor ſhift this is to maintain Circumciſion a covenant of works; as if a covenant of Grace could not be national: and though what hath been ſaid to prove Circumciſion a covenant of pure Grace, be ſufficient; yet I ſhall briefly add: If the promiſe made with *Abraham*, was a Goſpel promiſe, in which were contained national bleſſings, *in thy ſeed all the nations of the earth ſhall be bleſſed*; If the Jews ſhall be re-ingraffed as they were cut off; If by the ſtone cut out of the mountains, that ſhall fill the world be to be underſtood the Church and kingdom of Chriſt; If the knowledge of the Lord ſhall cover the earth, as the waters cover the ſeas; If there ſhall be a new heaven, and a new earth, wherein ſhall dwell righteouſneſs; If the kingdom of God was taken from the Jews and given to another Nation:

If the Church now coming out of the wilderneſs, holds parallel with the Church in the wilderneſs, under the Law; If the kingdoms of this world ſhall become the kingdoms of the Lord Chriſt, if that Commiſſion, *Mat.* 28. in order hereunto, be to teach all Nations, *&c.* If that Nation and kingdom that will not ſerve Chriſt ſhall be cut off, *Iſa* 60.12. Then are the bleſſings of a covenant of Grace national bleſſings; and what God intended in *Abrahams* covenant was national: I need ſay no more.

P. In pag. 49, 50, 51, 52. he runs into a large field of diſcourſe, and over-runs the old Scriptures again (as it is uſual with him) to prove, that though the Jews had the covenant of Circumciſion given them by entail, yet as to matter of Juſtification they were as far off, as Pagans, and heathens: and what Juſtification *Abraham* had, was while he was uncircumciſed, and yet withal granting, That the Jews had the advantage of other Nations, by having thoſe Eminent tenders of the Goſpel held out amongſt them. And notwithſtanding that covenant in the fleſh: yet they were all ſinners, and therefore there is but one way of Juſtification, which is by faith in his blood; therefore Circumciſion muſt needs be a covenant of works, for if it had been a covenant of Grace, it would have adminiſtred Juſtification with it; This is the full ſenſe as neer as I can collect, out of ſuch ſtragling diſcourſes.

Though the Scriptures he brings in theſe pages to prove what he aſſerts were before omitted, yet I ſhall here take them in, as moſt fit in this place, becauſe the running over things ſo often, would otherwiſe make the Anſwer ſo bulkiſh, and therefore,

A. Though he ſaith, Juſtification by faith was not given by Circumciſion, *i. e.* by the act done, as neither is it now given by Baptiſm, yet Juſtification was given in that Covenant of Grace which Circumciſion ſealed, and ſo the Elect did obtain it, *Rom.* 4.11. *He received the ſign of Circumciſion, a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of Faith, that he might be the Father of all that believe, though they be not Circumciſed.* So that Circumciſion was the covenants ſeal, and not the ſeal of his faith, out of which the Gentile Nations were excluded, till that Jewiſh Church was caſt off, ſo that the Jews were neerer then Pagans and Heathens, notwithſtanding any thing he affirms, becauſe the one was under the call of the Goſpel and the tenders of Grace, when the other was afar off, *Aliens and ſtrangers*, Eph. 2.11, 12, 13. But when the Goſpel came amongſt them alſo, *then they were made nigh by the blood*

of

of Christ. The Heathens in New-*England*, will any sober understanding Christian say, they are as neer to a state of Justification as those that are born and bred up, and dwell under the sound of the Gospel? yea Mr. *P.* himself doth contradict what he in this affirms, in acknowledging that the Jews were priviledged before other Nations, in having such precious tenders of the Gospel, *p.*49. so that we see he doth not stick fast to his own judgement in any thing. But wherein these precious priviledges should lye, or how the Gospel should be tendred, if they were not visible under the covenant of Grace, and so neerer then Heathens, I cannot see, nor, I am sure, he himself: for had not Justification run in the Jewish Ordinances, more freely then it did to the Gentiles, that had them not, they had instead of being priviledged, been more in bondage and slavery then any Nation in the world.

2. There is not any one place, or Text or syllable in the 2,3,or 4 to *Rom.*or in 12,15,17,18,22.of*Gen.*or 5,4,5.*Gal.*that saith, Justification by faith was not given in the covenant of Circumcision, or that Justification by faith is opposed to Circumcision, or that because *Abraham* was Justified, before circumcised; therefore Circumcision is a covenant of Works. But this the Texts say, that justification is to be had in the covenant of Circumcision, which were it a covenant of works, would not there be found, *Rom.*3.1,2,3,30. But

3. And because he tells us in pag.55. That there is no Text in all the Scripture more cleer to prove the covenant of Circumcision to be a covenant of works then this 4 *Rom.* setting Faith and Circumcision in opposition, shewing that *Abrahams* spiritual seed, had their justification in another covenant, and not in circumcision; I have therefore taken it into this place, because one answer will serve both.

To cleer this place therefore from this cloud of error cast upon it, I shall stay some time, to search into it. The words are these; *What shall we say then, that* Abraham *our Father as appertaining to the flesh hath found? For if* Abraham *was justified by works, He hath whereof to glory, but not before God; but* Abraham *believed God*, &c. *And how was it then reckoned? when he was in Circumcision, or in uncircumcision? not in Circumcision*, &c.

A. By comparing this with the preceding chapter, as also with *ch.*5,6,7,8. we finde the Roman Church that had imbraced the Ordinances of the Gospel, were then falling back into the works of the Law, and those legal Ordinances, in them to gain justification. And

therefore they would be listening after those false Teachers that preicht up Circumcision after the manner of *Moses*, which was the prevailing error in that Church, and is at this day, it being so fallen that they maintain good works, do justifie. Now the Apostle to bring them off from this error, bids them look upon *Abraham*, whom they acknowledged to be the father of the faithful; and see how the case stood with him, how he was justifyed; secretly implying that if he that was the Father of all believers was not justifyed by works, then it would be unreasonable in his children to think that they were; and therefore it was their duty to follow him: by which we see *Abraham* is held forth as a publick person in the Gospel, to which Gospel-Churches are to have recourse, to rectifie errors in doctrines of Faith; and if upon search they found that *Abraham* was justifyed in uncircumcision, then they should not think that Circumcision was of absolute necessity to justification; and therefore tells them it was their mistake, the Law was never intended by God to justifie any, but *ch.* 3.9. *both Jew and Gentile are all under sin*, and ver. 20. *therefore by the deeds of the Law no flesh can be justifyed, for all have sinned, and are therefore justifyed freely by his Grace without the deeds of the Law*, ver. 28. upon which the Romans make this Objection, *Rom.* 4.1. What benefit or advantage then hath *Abraham* found, to whom the covenant was made? The meaning is because *Abraham* had not his justification by circumcision; therefore they could not see any Gospel-benefit that came by that Ordinance at all; so much is implyed in the words: the like also ch. 3. *what profit then is there of Circumcision?* and it is the same objection in effect that M. *P.* makes, onely a little changed, For thus his runs: If *Abraham* was not justified in the covenant of Circumcision, then is Circumcision a covenant of works; both which the Apostle answers, that though *Abraham* and his seed were not justifyed by the Law, as a law or covenant of works; yet there was a considerable advantage the Jews had by circumcision, *and chiefly, because unto them were committed the oracles of God*, and ch. 9.4. *who are Israelites*, i. e. a peculiar Nation inclosed by God himself from all the Nations of the world, *to them appertains the adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the Promises, whose are the Fathers, and of whom concerning the flesh Christ came*; As if he had said, all this heap and bundle of benefits came in to the Jews and that Nation, which no Nation under heaven had besides, and yet for all this there were many that did not believe, ch. 3.3. *For what though some did not believe?*

shall

shall their unbelief make the Faith of God without effect ? God forbid; as if he had said, The end for which God did so much priviledge them above others was, that all his might believe; but yet some did not; implying that some did, *i. e.* many of them were justifyed. Therefore ch. 4. 9. he draws towards a result, *cometh this blessedness then upon the Circumcision onely, or upon the uncircumcision also? how was it then reckoned?* i. e. If *Abraham* was justifyed in uncircumcision, then the righteousness of Faith comes not upon the Circumcision onely: and ver. 12. *To them who are not of the Circumcision onely*: and ver. 16. Not to that seed onely which is of the Law And then the Apostle concludes, *ver.* 23. *that it was not written for Abrahams sake alone that righteousness was imputed to him, but for us also*, i. e. *Rom.* and all other Gentiles, if they believe, to whom *Abraham* is as well a Father, as to the Jews.

So that this triumphant place gives not the least continuance to his opinion; either that Circumcision was a covenant of works, or that it stands in direct opposition to faith, or that God gave a covenant of works to *Abraham*, to seal a covenant of Grace, as he consequentially affirms, p. 53. Therefore such an interpretation as he hath given of this place is most unsound.

The like answer is to be given to that place, *Phil.* 3. 2, 3, 4. which he brings in pag. 55. as an Appendix to this second Argument; the Philippians were also revolting to seek after Justification by the works of the Law, the teachers of which Doctrine the Apostle calls *dogs*, and *evil-workers*. And if any had cause to boast of the law of Works, he had more; yet to him it was but dung and dogs meat, all his priviledges of being a Jew, a Pharisee, Circumcised; *one that concerning the Law was blameless*. All this saith *Paul*, I can boast of, but what is this as to matter of justification, which is by faith alone in Christ? The like plain answer also is and may be given to that other place, *Gal.* 3, 3. which Church also were back sliding into the same error, and therefore he calls them fools, and tells them they were bewitched *ch.* 5. 1. And if they would be seeking Justification by works, they should find they were mistaken. *For as many as sought to be justifyed by the works of the Law, were under the curse. And that no man by the works of the Law was ever justifyed, is evident, because the just shall live by Faith*, ver. 10, 11. And therefore he sends them also to *Abrahams* covenant, *For to Abraham and his seed were the promises made.* And *ver.* 18. he shews them the ill-consequence that would follow, if they thought to be justifyed by works, *For then the inheritance must*

be

be by works; that is the inheritance of *Abrahams* promises; both for the Land of *Canaan*, and all other spiritual blessings. *If it were by the Law, then it is no more of promises*, But *God gave them to Abraham by promise*, And not by a covenant of works, remember that Mr *P.* upon this again comes with the old Objection, *Wherefore then serveth the Law*, If a man may not be justifyed and saved by the works of the Law? to what end and purpose then was it given? The answer is, *it was added because of transgression*, that is, to make sin look like sin; and thereby to ingage Gods people then, to walk close in the duties thereof, and in ver. 21. The Apostle directly confutes Mr. *Patients* Doctrine. *Is the Law then against the Promises, or in opposition to the Promises? God forbid.* By all which it appears that the Law was no covenant of Works, nor is Circumcision or any part of the Law opposed to Faith, as he would make us believe; but this was the great mistake of many in Primitive Churches by false teachers means. And so of all *Israel*, as it is also of Mr *P.* that the Law was given to the Church of the Jews as a covenant of works, which God never intended to any such end or purpose.

CHAP. IX.

The next thing we come to is the several Arguments he brings in to prove Circumcision onely a seal to Abraham, *answered.* p. 53.

I. FIrst, because the righteousness of Faith which it sealed, *Abraham* had it, before the seal was given, but his posterity could not be said to believe at eight days old: Therefore it was a seal to him, and not to them.

A. The seal was not annext to *Abrahams* Faith, as *Abrahams*, but to Gods covenant made with *Abraham*; therefore it is called the seal of the righteousness of Faith. So that what it sealed to *Abraham* was, as he was *an heir of the same Promises with Isaac and Jacob*, Heb. 11. 9. therefore what it sealed to him as an heir, it sealed to *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and so to *all believers as co-heirs of the same inheritance*, Heb. 6. 17.

2. If it was a seal of *Abrahams* Faith onely, then it must be either as it was a weak faith, or strong faith.

1 It could not be the first, because *Abrahams* faith is by the Apostle said not to be weak, *Rom.* 4. 19, 20.

2. If

2. If it had been given as a badge of honor to *Abrahams* Faith (as I have seen it affirmed in a piece of *C.B.*) as a ſtrong faith: then it ſhould have been given to *Adam* and *Noah*, who had as ſtrong faiths as *Abraham*; and leſs Goſpel-light then *Abraham* had to work it.

3. There was no neceſſity to have *Abrahams* juſtification ſealed, more then *Adams*, *Seths*, *Noahs*, or any of his predeceſſors, eſpecially if it be conſidered what M. *P.* himſelf grants, that he was juſtifyed twenty four years before this ſeal was given, therefore

4. Had it not been a ſeal to *Iſaac*, as well as to *Abraham*, and ſo not onely a ſeal of *Abrahams* faith, it might have been given upon the birth of *Iſhmael*, and *Abraham* need not have ſtaid for a ſon of promiſe, for it would have ſealed as much then to *Abraham*, as it did after, if it was not the covenant-ſeal.

5. Had it not been a ſeal to *Iſaac*, and ſo a part of the covenant, then *Iſaacs* not being circumciſed had been no breach of the covenant; directly againſt that place, *Gen.*17.10. For a ſeal the Apoſtle calls it, and a ſign God calls it. So that had it onely been a ſeal of *Abrahams* Faith, the covenant had not come ſealed to *Iſaac*; becauſe the ſeal reacht onely the Faith of *Abraham*, and when he dyed, the ſeal was broken off. Therefore

6. It is a cleer truth, that as the bleſſings of the covenant were made to *Abraham* by Promiſe, and to his ſeed, ſo Gods main drift being to make *thoſe covenant-bleſſings ſure to all the heirs of Promiſe*, Heb.6.17. he therefore deals as a man that would be believed. Firſt he promiſes, ſecondly, he ſwears to confirm that Promiſe, Thirdly, he ſeals what he hath promiſed. So the ſeal becomes the covenant-ſeal, as the oath is the Covenants oath: and what God promiſed to *Abraham*, he promiſed to his ſeed; and what he confirmed by oath to *Abraham* he confirmed to his ſeed; and what God therefore ſealed to *Abraham*, he ſealed alſo to his ſeed. All which was *to ſhew the immutability of his Counſel to the heirs of Promiſe*, not only to ſuch as were heirs under the Law, but to the *worlds end*, as the Apoſtle tells us before, in the place quoted.

II. His next reaſon or Argument why it ſealed onely to *Abraham* is, becauſe it is ſaid, *he received it, that he might be the Father of all that believe*. Which could not be ſaid of *Iſaac*, becauſe he was but a child.

A. Though *Abraham* was made the Father of the faithful, by having that ſeal given him; yet he could not have been ſuch a father without ſuch a ſon, becauſe they are relatives, not onely in the natu-

ral

ral relation, but in the promiſe, for though *Iſhmael* was born thirteen yeers before *Iſaac* was promiſed; yet had God given him circumciſion then, *Abraham* had not been the Father of the faithful, becauſe *Iſhmael* was not a faithful child. So that, that which was required to make *Abraham* a father of a faithful ſon, was required in *Iſaac* to make him ſuch a ſon of a faithful Father: Therefore that ſeal that was given to *Abraham* as a father, was given to *Iſaac* as a ſon.

III. His third Argument to prove it a ſeal onely to *Abraham* is Here is the ſpirit of God affirming the ſealing uſe of Circumciſion to *Abraham* onely, upon a reaſon ſpecial to him; therefore where the Scripture hath not a mouth to ſpeak, we muſt not have an ear to hear.

A. The ſpirit of God ſpeaks no ſuch thing, but the ſpirit of M. *P.* for where is it ſaid, *it was a ſeal to him onely?* no ſuch Text is to be found in all the Scriptures, for as is before ſaid, what it ſealed to him as a father, it ſealed to *Iſaac* as a ſon of that Father, for the covenant related to poſterity. I may therefore ſay of him as the Prophet ſaid of the falſe Prophets, who ſaid the Lord ſaith it, as here M *P.* doth, when indeed the Lord hath not ſpoken: therefore the Scripture hath a mouth to ſpeak, if he had an underſtanding heart to know when and what it ſpeaks: let ſuch therefore who have ears to hear, hear what the ſpirit ſpeaks to the Churches.

IV. *P.* A fourth ground or reaſon he gives that Circumciſion ſealed onely to *Abraham*, is drawn from *Rom.*4.13. *The promiſe that he ſhould be the heir of the world was not to him and his ſeed through the Law*, i. e. ſaith M. *P.* through the covenant of Circumciſion, *But through the righteouſneſs of Faith. For if they that be of the Law be heirs, then Faith is made void.*

A. 1. He here again ſuppoſes that which is denyed, and the contrary proved, *i. e.* That Circumciſion was not a covenant of works.

2. When it is ſaid *the promiſe of his being the heir of the world was not made to Abraham through the Law*, The Apoſtle means, that it was not to be confined and ſhut up to the generations of the Law onely, and ſo it was not to his ſeed through the Law onely, but through the righteouſneſs of Faith; that is, his Patrimony came upon ſuch high tearms as would *reach to a thouſand generations*, Pſal. 105. even to the Gentiles under the Goſpel to the worlds end: and that this is his meaning is clear, by the following words, *For if they which are of the Law be heirs* (i. e. They and they onely, but heirs they were) *Faith is made void.* That is, the faith which *Abraham* had, by which he did believe the multiplying of his ſeed in all Nati-

ons

ons upon the grounds of the Promise, that faith is quite frustrated, because it went no further then the generations of the Law; *And therefore it is of faith that it might be by Grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed*, and then he fully explains what he said before, *Not sure to that seed onely, which were of the Law*, where the word *onely* doth suppose it was sure to the legal seed, therefore it cannot be meant of a covenant of works, for so the promise was never sure to any from the Creation to this day, or ever shall be.

3. If the place were to be understood in his sense, namely of a covenant of works, Then it confutes in direct terms what he hath so much pleaded for in his book. As that *Canaan* should be given by a covenant of works. For the promise that he should be the heir of the world, (in which that land was included) was not to him and his seed through the Law, *i. e.* saith Mr *P.* not by the covenant of Circumcision, but through the righteousness of faith. And if the Apostle saith, not by that covenant, then why doth Mr *P.* so often affirm elsewhere it was?

Thus we see, there is nothing in all he hath said, that proves Circumcision either a covenant of works or seal to *Abraham* onely, but enough to prove it a seal to all the heirs of promise, even whilst they are infants: All ye therefore that belong to the covenant of Grace, fear not to give your infant-seed that Ordinance which now is the seal of the covenant.

P. The last Scripture he here brings to prove Circumcision a covenant of works is *Gal.* 4. latter end, where the Apostle compares the two covenants to *Sarah* and *Hagar*, the covenant of Circumcision is held forth to be the bondwoman, *ch.* 5. 1.2,3 *ch.* 6.13. which place doth prove, the covenant made in the fleshly line of *Abraham* is a covenant of Works. And that which the Gospel is set in opposition to, For the covenant of Grace is, *I will put my Law in their hearts* but the covenant of Circumcision is not in the heart, but in the flesh.

A. The diligent Reader may easily observe the palpable contradictions that are here to be found. *Hagar* types out the covenant of works. *Sarah* types out the covenant of grace, and the fleshly covenant of Circumcision (as he calls it) which is typed out by *Hagar*, is made in the fleshly line of *Abraham* which must be *Ishmael*. And then he contradicts what he hath been all this while maintaining, *i. e.* that the fleshly line is *Isaac* and *Jacob*, in which the covenant of Circumcision was to run: and so also he oppoſeth the Apostle *Gal.* 4. 23

But he that was born of the bondwoman, was born after the flesh: but he of the free-woman was by Promise; so that what *Paul* calls the children by promise, he calls the children of the flesh. Thus men leaving truth making wise, God leaves them to publish their own folly.

That place *Gal.*1.2,3. is already answered, they were such that were falling back from Grace to be justified by works through their gross mistake, thinking as Mr *P.* doth, that the Law had been given for a covenant of works.

Lastly, Though God hath promised to write the new covenant in the heart, yet the seals of that covenant are written in the flesh: so it was then. For God writ the new covenant in the heart, under the Law, and yet circumcision was no covenant of works. But a figure of what God did within, *Deut.*30.6. *Rom:*2.28,29. by which places we may see Circumcision had the same promises attending it then to believers and their seed, as baptism hath now. And it may with as much evidence of truth, be said, that baptism is a covenant of Works, because it is administred upon the flesh; as Circumcision was then. Therefore all his Arguments and Scriptures he hath brought hitherto to prove Circumcision a covenant of works, have been ill drawn, and worse applyed.

CHAP. X.

Wherein his 3, 4, 5, *and* 6. *Arguments are answered to prove Circumcision a covenant of Works.*

III. *P:* pag. 58. WE are now come to his third Argument, and that is, because there is no promise of eternal life in it, but only a temporal blessing in the Land of *Canaan*, as protection and provision, and the like, to prove this he quotes *Heb.*8.6: *Jer.*11.2,3. *Deut.*7:12,13, & 30,13.

A. 1. That Circumcision, had no promise of eternal life attending it is false, for eternal life was promised in Gods telling *Abraham*, he would be his God; it is such a *blank*, that a believer may write what happiness he will in it: God could not say more, nor a believer desire more.

2. It had the promise of the heart-Circumcision in order to prepare a soul for heaven, as the places above cited prove. Therefore it had the promise also of eternal life.

3. If

3. If it had not had the promiſe of eternal happineſs, but onely an earthly *Canaan*, and protection therein, then in vain doth S. *Paul* ſay, *God was not aſhamed to be called Abrahams God*, Heb. 11.16. And *in vain alſo did he with Iſaac and Jacob walk as Pilgrims in that land, expecting a better Country*, i. e. *heavenly*, Heb. 11.8,14,16.

4. As to thoſe Texts he mentions, there is not one of them proves that God only promiſed *Abrahams* ſeed proſperity in *Canaan*, though that alſo was included, upon their obedience to Gods covenant, which was of Grace, not works, as hath been before largely proved We ſee therefore how well he hath diſtinguiſht the Covenants.

P. IV. His next Argument to prove Circumciſion a covenant of works is, becauſe a man by laying out a little mony might have bought a heathen into this covenant, and have intereſſed him into all the priviledges thereof.

A. The covenant had *two parts*, one *external*, relating to mans duty in forms of worſhip; The other *ſpiritual*, relating to communion with God in thoſe forms, as hath been often mentioned; into the firſt of theſe, all the perſons born in *Abrahams* houſe, or bought with mony were to be admitted, and the reaſon is, becauſe all *Abrahams* family ſo qualifyed were *the viſible Church*, and ſuch a taking into his family was a taking into the Church: which alſo was a type of the purchaſe that Chriſt ſhould pay by his blood. For the Gentiles, were to be brought into Church-communion, of which that was the firſt fruits, both to them and their ſeed; for doing whereof, Gods command did bear him out. And this was to be a ſtanding rule to *Iſrael*, when they came to be a kingdom, becauſe the foundation of the kingdom was laid in *Abrahams* family, Therefore,

2. When he ſaith, that all ſo bought, were purchac'd into all the priviledges of the covenant, it is a groſs untruth: for juſtification, and ſalvation were the choice priviledges of that covenant which they could not be bought into, and in that ſenſe *Peters* anſwer to *Simon Magus*, *Thy mony periſh with thee*, had been properly applyed, though yet in the other conſideration, what he did was an Ordinance of God.

V. *P.* His next Argument is, becauſe men out of this covenant might be ſaved, and ſuch as were in it might be damned.

A. Here is ſtill the ſame diſtinction to be noted as before, for thoſe that went to hell were never intereſſed in the ſpiritual part of the covenant, but onely into the external forms of worſhip; the like

instance we have in the Apostles days, *Judas*, *Simon Magus*, with the rest of those hypocrites, and Apostates, were all interessed in the external part of the covenant, and yet went to hell: this likewise was the condition of the *foolish virgins*, who because they had lamps lighted, thought themselves well enough, and there rested: in this sense also are the words of Christ to be understood. [The children of the kingdom shall be cast out.] I would a little return this Argument to M: *P.* How many dipt Apostates have fallen quite away from all grace and goodness of late yeers, both from them and us? Surely it cannot be denyed, but they were visibly once in the covenant; therefore all those Scriptures and examples by him brought in, pag. 62,63,64. are by this distinction answered, and the false varnish by him put upon them is hereby washt off, that so they may be seen in their glory and splendor.

2. It also appears that it was the same covenant of Grace that justifyed *Lot*, *Job*, and all *Jobs* friends that were godly, though dwelling in another Country, that justifyed *Abraham* and his seed: for though they had not the seal of the covenant, because *Abraham* was the person pitcht upon, to whom it should be first administred; yet they were worshippers of God in a solemn way of sacrificing: the like we may charitably think now, that many in the world who have not the same means of Gospel-Ordinances, may yet have sincere hearts to God, and be as a scattered seed of some gracious predecessors; and yet not be within the visible pale of the covenant.

This also duely considered, is a full answer to the rest of those instances, of *Davids* sons, and *Abrahams* sons, with the whole lump of *Israel*, of all which many were damned, because onely in the visible part of the covenant. We may therefore see hitherto what feeble Arguments Mr. *Patient* brings to prove Circumcision a covenant of works.

VI. *P.* His sixth Argument for the ends aboveſaid is, because this covenant of Circumcision may be broken, *Gen.* 17. 14.

A. Still the former distinction kept makes the answer easie and plain; for such who broke the covenant, broke but the external part thereof; the other part could not be broken, and in this sense also the covenant in Gospel days is broken, and as God unchurcht *Israel* for breach of covenant, so he doth still, when a Church or people do apostatize from his Ordinances: The Apostle tells us so, *Heb* 3.6 *Whose house are we if we hold fast the confidence and rejoycing of the hope firm to the end*, his meaning is, we are his house if we keep to the

the *Ordinances of worship*: implying, That if a people once cast off the Ordinances, they have broken the covenant, and stand related to Christ no longer as his house. I am sure that the extent of this Explication will reach Mr *Patient*, who hath broken the covenant of God, by casting out of his seed. And upon this very hinge it was, That all those examples of Gods judgements upon *Israel* are given, when they revolted from God, and brake this covenant. then God plagues them and cuts them off; and when they renewed their covenant, fasted, humbled their souls and repented, then God shewed Mercy; all which agrees to that remarkable place, which proves the covenant of Grace conditional, *Gen.* 18. 19. *For I know Abraham will command his children and his houshould after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgement. That the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him*; cleerly implying, that if *Abrahams* seed did not walk close in their duties, they should fall short of their expectations, as we afterwards finde *Israel* did.

Therefore whereas M. *P.* saith it is impossible the covenant of Grace should be broken, it is false. For the external part may be broken, which is part of the covenant: but the inward part of it can never be broken.

P. Pag. 67. He comes to answer this distinction of the covenant as an Objection, but so poorly, that it seems he would gladly favour his own opinion; persons saith he, may profess outwardly, to be in Christ, and so in the covenant of Grace by profession: but because it was but a profession onely, and not in truth; therefore they profess to be in that wherein they never were.

A. We are now speaking of persons being in the covenant as the Scripture holds them forth, to be within it; And as men may in the judgement of Charity believe persons to be in it, in order to Communion of Saints in the world. If therefore the Scriptures tell us there is a twofold being in it, then persons are in the covenant that are within the visible part of it, as hath been sufficiently proved, and as his own practice doth acknowledge: so that in his answer to the Objection, he rather works like a ferry-man, then a preacher; he seems to look towards an answer, but rows the other way: therefore whereas he saith, we have an infallible rule to judge *Abraham* and his seed to be within the covenant of Circumcision, because God saith it, and the Objection before is groundless.

A. It

A. It hath been already cleared, that Circumcision was part of the covenant of Grace; and therefore by this he confesseth that persons are visible within it, because the infallible rule of the word of God saith it; and so was the seed he speaks of infallible (as he calls it) within the Covenant: The like now, all that by profession, are admitted into Gospel-Churches. We have the same rule to judge by. That they are as really within the covenant as the seed of *Abraham* was then; By which we may see the Objection stands in force, notwithstanding those puffs of wind, he hath given at it.

2. Neither doth his bringing in that great Catalogue of *Israels* sins at all help him; For though it is not denyed but the most part of them were wicked and prophane, yet as a separated people God had chosen out, from the rest of the world, to be a Church, to whom he committed his *Oracles*, in that sense they were a people in covenant, and so stood till they were divorc't, and cast off from being a people. For which see *Rom.*9. at large. And the reason why they were so wicked and profane, may be gathered from that place before mentioned, *Gen.*18.19. because they kept not up family duties, but grew carnal and loose in their Judgements; and therefore looseness in practice and conversation followed; a needful Item to all Gods people in these days.

The like answer is to be given to *Joh.*8 40,44. by all which then it appears, that not one Argument he hath hitherto brought, proves Circumcision to be a covenant of works: we are now arrived at his last Argument, and that drawn from the many inconveniencies that will follow, if it be maintained a covenant of Grace: therefore so to understand Scriptures, as to cross any fundamentals, cannot be agreeable to the mind of God.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Contains a vindication of the First, Second, and Third Fundamentall.

P. pag. 71. IF the covenant of Circumcision made with *Abraham* and his seed, and those also that were born in his house, or bought with mony amongst the families of *Israel*, were a covenant of Grace, then it interessed all persons by nature or practice, into the choice priviledges of Adoption, sonship, justification, the inward work of sanctification; all which is asserted by those who hold Infant-baptism: And then this fundamental in Religion is denyed, *That all mankinde by nature are children of wrath*, and that all men are not charged under sin, both Jews and Gentiles, and that none is righteous, no not one. But saith Mr *P.* be it known to you, it was a truth through *Israel* in their Generations, and then he brings in many Scriptures to prove that men by nature are children of wrath, *&c.*

A. 1. And be it known to you again, That this fundamental truth is such that we all vail to, and therefore, it is not so much as toucht, much less rooted up by our Doctrine or practice, in maintaining Circumcision a Covenant of Grace, which I now come to make appear, and still by the former distinction; Therefore I shall desire the Reader to give me his hand, that we may not break company till the storm is over.

1 There is a twofold Adoption, and therefore
2 A twofold sonship,
3 A twofold Sanctification,
4 A twofold Justification.

These and all these, outward, and inward: so that, by vertue of the extent of the covenant made with *Abraham*, persons are born into those outward priviledges, though not into the spiritual part thereof: and thus were *Israel* adopted, *Rom.* 9. 4. For it is one of the first priviledges that St. *Paul* reckons *Israel* had, *to whom pertained the Adoption and the glory*, &c.

By which we see that the Adoption appertained to all *Israel*, that is, God made choice of them, to make them his peculiar sons and people, by taking them into the visible pale of the covenant of grace, when

when all the Nations of the earth besides were past by. So that no people, or Nation in the world could say God was their father, but the Jews; which is the benefit of Adoption in either respect. But inward Adoption runs more spiritually, *therefore called the spirit of Adoption*, Rom. 8.

Thus also, all *Israel* were the *sons of God*, for which the Scripture is so cleer. That such who deny it do but discover much ignorance. See therefore these Texts, *Hos.* 4. 1. *ch.* 11. 1. *Joh.* 8. 41. *Ezek.* 20. 21. And thus they are called the first-born, *Exod* 4. 22, 23. And they had all the service of sons to do to God in the wilderness. The like also of sanctification, when persons are by Gods appointment separated and set apart to a holy use, of which, divers instances might be given, before and since Christ; so also Justification, outward before men, as well as inward, or how else should there be any communion of Saints on earth? Thus *Hagars* son, though by nature born under a covenant of works, was a Church member. And he could call *Abraham* father, as *Isaac* could, though not under such a spiritual consideration, for still the in-works of Adoption, Sonship Justification, and Sanctification, have run by promise, in a close hidden and spiritual way, working upon and changing the heart: And though *Isaac*, *Jacob*, and the rest of the line, were all born in sin, as well as *Ishmael*, and *Esau*, yet the Promise takes time to work, and brings in the Elect of God, some later, some sooner; yea, let us bring down this again to a parallel, and compare it to the practice of M. *P.* Sure I am, he cannot say, that all, he, and others with him plunged upon their profession of faith, are the real Adopted sons of God, or really holy, or really justifyed or sanctifyed, that is spiritually; But this they may say, they are visibly such, and some may be such also spiritually; but who they be, is unknown to man, and yet all were alike by nature born in sin, and children of wrath.

2. And thus all those Scriptures, *Ephes.* 2. 2. *by nature children of wrath*, Rom. 3. 9 *none righteous, no not one*, are answered. This was also the equal condition of *Paul*, *David*, and the rest born and conceived in sin; and yet, as *Abrahams* seed, they were interessed in the covenant then, as believers and their seed are now. We may then see how his heap of chaff cast upon the truth, begins already to be blown away.

II. *P.* The second fundamental which he proclaims to the world, that our practice overturns is, stability in a covenant of eternal life; for if all Israel were born in the covenant of Grace then all should be

be saved, but there were but a remnant of *Israel* saved, all the rest damned. *Isa.*10.22,23. *Rom.*9.22. And if so born, they must needs fall away from Grace.

A. As stability in Grace is a glorious truth, so neither doth this touch it. For it onely makes the outward part of the covenant instable. That is a falling away from their visible being in the covenant, for as hath been said, a man may be in the covenant, yet not in the Grace of the covenant. Thus *Israel* and all those Gospel hypocrites mentioned, fell away, but the election still remained: so the branches that were in Christ, *Joh.*15. *that bare not fruit, were cut off and withered*: and thus all those Texts that speak of a falling away are to be understood. The like now; though many Apostates fall from the ways of God, yet the covenant remains stable, and the same for ever.

III. *P.* The third foundation he pretends to be shaken, is the necessity of conversion, and regeneration which is a Doctrine eminently confirmed by Christ in the Gospel, for which he brings several Texts of Scripture: but to hold a covenant of life to run upon the carnal seed of believers opposeth this: for then when Christ said, *Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God, Israel* might answer, that's not true, we have an interest in the covenant of Grace already, *and except ye believe that I am he, ye shall dy in your sins*. they might say again, that's not true, for we know another way to heaven then by believing, and 1 *Joh.*5: *He that hath not the Son hath not life.* This error replyes, there be thousands interessed in life, without having Christ, by carnal generation. Thus far he, with much more of the like stuffe, with which he fills three pages together.

A. Neither doth it at all intrench upon this Doctrine, as falsly suggested: therefore to cleer this, we are to consider, first the ground of this mistake of his, from whence it riseth, as any man may easily see; namely, that the Doctrine of Conversion, Repentance, and Regeneration, is to be preacht onely to such as are without the Church, and Kingdom of Christ: for his argument runs as taking it for granted, that such as are the subjects of the kingdom, are such in reality, when as by the former distinctions, it is most apparent, that some are such visibly onely, and some really.

2. Therefore consider, the Doctrines mentioned are part of that Gospel, which is the kingdoms Gospel, as Christ calls it, and hath been ever preacht to the subjects of the kingdom, so it was to *Israel* of old; and though believers and their seed were taken into the cove-

nant (already proved to be of grace) yet this Doctrine of the new birth was preacht to them; which is abundantly cleer from Christs words to *Nicodemus*, *Joh.*3.2 place by himself quoted: *Art thou a Doctor in Israel, and knowest not what the doctrine of the new birth means?* implying, That he shewed himself very ignorant, when he knew not that which was preacht amongst *Israel*: adding this also, That the Ordinance of Circumcision so frequently used, was but a Type of the Circumcision upon the heart, yea the whole tenor of the old-Testament runs in such terms that cleerly shew their blessedness lies in repenting and turning to God in pardon of sin, in setting their delight in the Laws of the Lord, trusting in God, and setting their hope in God, the book of Psalms is full of it. So also in those primitive Churches planted by the Apostles themselves, who in admission of members, had a better insight to the truth of grace upon the heart, then any since, and yet this Doctrine they preacht to the Church, 2 *Cor.*5.17. *Rom.*2.29. *ch*6.11.8.10. *Gal.*5.19. *Eph.*4.23. therefore such as think the Doctrines of Repentance, New-birth, *&c.* should be preacht to the world onely, may hence see their mistakes, amongst which number Mr *P.* is one, I shall still draw down the parallel to his practice, which I judge to be a good way to convince our dissenting friends of their error: can he think, that all that runs in the same race with him, I mean into the water, that they have no need of preaching Repentance, or the new-birth amongst them? surely if that be his judgment, he discovers more ignorance and weakness then ever *Nicodemus* did. Therefore

3. Let us glean up his Scriptures. The reproof that *John* gave the Pharisees, was not for pleading a title to *Abrahams* covenant as his seed, for it is evident he baptized upon that accompt: for had not the Pharisees claimed the Ordinances as *Abrahams* seed, because the rest did so, the reproof given them had been little better then non-sense, but he checks them for their wickedness, in not walking as became *Abrahams* children. So also *Joh.* 8.32. The like also *Luke* 16. a place M. *P.* much delights to name, thinking it makes for his opinion because *Dives* in hell owned *Abraham* as a Father, and *Abraham* owned him as a son, but yet for all that saith Mr. *Patient*, he was damned.

A. There is none denyes, but *Abraham* had more children damned then saved, yet nevertheless such as were saved, were *Abrahams* children and saved by *Abrahams* covenant. And it is impossible that M. *P.* himself should ever be saved out of that covenant, though at present

ſent he ſo much ſlights it. The reproof therefore that was given to *Dives*, was not becauſe he called *Abraham* Father, as one of his ſons, but becauſe he lived as an Epicure and a glutton, as the whole parable makes evident. And methinks *Abrahams* Charity ſhould be a ſufficient reproof to Mr. *P.* for his want thereof: whereas therefore he tels us we have found out a newer way to heaven, then by the Doctrine of regeneration, it is but a taunt, wherein he diſcovers by what ſpirit he writes and ſpeaks; Let therefore ſuch ingenious ſpirits to whom he makes his appeal, judge righteous judgement.

CHAP. XII.

Wherein the fourth and fifth Fundamentals are maintained.

IV. *P.* pag. 79. THe next Fundamental he tells us we deſtroy by maintaining Circumciſion a covenant of Grace, Is the Doctrine of the new covenant, the nature of it, and the manner of Gods making of it with the ſoul, in which he writes his Laws in the heart, and pardons their ſins, infuſeth Faith, binds himſelf over to be their God without any condition in the creature, And thus and no otherwiſe, doth God make a new covenant with the ſoul, whereas this dream would make us believe that a whole Nation may be in the new covenant, and yet have no work of Grace wrought upon the heart.

A. That the new covenant hath conditions, hath been already proved. God neither pardons, ſaves, nor juſtifies any man, without the condition of the covenant, which ever was, is, and will be. Faith and Repentance, which two are of a large extent, and brings in a cloſe walking with God in his Word and Ordinances, and leads to a holy life, without which none ſhall ever ſee the face of God. Look back to *Abrahams* covenant, was it not made with him as a believer, *Rom.* 4. 3? what ſaith the Scripture? *Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteouſneſs*, Had not *Abraham* been a believer, righteouſneſs had not been imputed to him; and that this is a condition, the Apoſtle makes it cleer, ver. 23, 24. *Now it was not written for his ſake alone, that it was imputed to him: But for us alſo, to whom it ſhall be imputed, if we believe.* So that faith is cleerly held forth as the condition both to Jew and Gentile, *Iſa.* 56. 6. *He that keepeth the Sabboth from polluting it, and taketh hold on my covenant,*

Him will I make joyful in my house of prayer. For my house shall be called the house of prayer of all Nations: what covenant is this, that a man must lay hold of but that of free-grace, which relates to his house of prayer in all Nations? *For his Gospel-house*, with whom that covenant is made, is as well called the *house of prayer* as the Temple: so that look how far the *house of prayer* goes to that people and Nation, both the Sabboth and Covenant goes also; so as they must keep the one, and take hold of the other.

Obj. *But saith the opponent, though Faith be the hand, yet it is God that gives the hand, so that still the Covenant is without conditions?*

Ans. This is still to argue *pro* and *con*. For if Faith be the hand and condition of the covenant, then it is on the creatures side, that it is so, and not on Gods. And the covenant is not made with any creature till they have a hand to receive it. And though it be given by free-grace, yet when it is given, it is the creatures hand; as the hand and eye of my body, it is free-grace that gives them, but when they are given, they are my hands and my eys. And thus the Apostle argues, it is of faith that it may be by grace; and hereby grace doth abound, that God should give the Gospel, and Covenant upon conditions; and when these conditions are wrought by his Grace, yet he should look upon them, as ours; yea Mr *Patient* hath before acknowledged, That faith is the condition of the covenant, and therefore whereas he here tells us God infuseth faith, and binds himself over to the soul without conditions, it is a meer contradiction; because that faith so infused, is that condition which takes hold on the covenant; and by this new covenant, were *Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, David, Solomon, Nathan*, and all the people of God under the old-Testament, justifyed and saved; into the visible part of which covenant, all their seed was taken, yea the whole Nation of *Israel*. And that they shall be so taken in again, see *Rom.* 11. at large compared with *Jer.* 31. 1. therefore for him to call it a dream, is not onely a discovery of his shallowness, but also an affront put upon those holy worthies before mentioned, by which he doth manifest it to the world, affirming that the Covenant of Grace hath no conditions, that he is a high Antinomian, as well as an Anabaptist.

V. *P.* pag. 80. His next Fundamental is the doctrine of Justification by Faith; which this opinion of Circumcision to be a covenant of Grace destroys, in that it holds forth another way to obtain Justification by, then faith, which is by carnal birth of believing parents.

rents. For if a ſoul be admitted into a covenant of life thereby; I hope you are not ignorant, that juſtification by faith is the great priviledge of the new covenant, and really the portion of all that are in that covenant.

A. He here affirms two direct untruths. But whats that, when there is nothing elſe to be found in his whole book?

1 He tells us we hold another way of juſtification then faith, by carnal birth, *&c.* which we abhor.

2 Another groſs untruth is, That Juſtification to life is the real portion, of all within the covenant of Grace.

Therefore let the former diſtinction be ſtill minded; and then it is apparent, that we affirm no more, but that believers ſeed have right to the external part of the covenant of grace, which Circumciſion was a part of, as hath been proved: as for the ſpiritual part of the covenant, namely, that juſtification by faith, which he ſpeaks of; it hath ever been conveyed in a ſecret way of the ſpirits working upon the heart: from which it is evident, that perſons may be viſibly within the covenant, and yet have no real work of Grace in their ſouls, ſo as to be juſtifyed, as thoſe examples beforementioned do abundantly prove, for then *Judas* had been really juſtifyed. Take in alſo the parallel; then al themembers of their dipt ſocieties, would be really juſtifyed; had we nothing elſe to plead, but the ſenſible experience of theſe times; it would be enough to ſhew the falſity of ſuch an aſſertion: for how many not onely of them, but of others alſo have fallen away to diabolical deluſions? Thus far therefore we ſee thoſe foundations, by him pretended to be ſhaken, remain, notwithſtanding his high ſwelling language, untoucht, and unmoveable: —— again

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

The sixth and seventh Fundamentals maintained.

P. pag. 80, 81, 82. THis opinion destroys the doctrine and foundation of Gospel-Churches. The matter thereof, which is Saints by calling, spiritual worshippers, *Joh.* 4. 23. lively stones, 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. persons redeemed from a vain conversation, 1 *Pet.* 1. 18. brought out of darkness into his marvellous light, 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. Now this opinion brings in a whole Nation to be a Church, all born of their body, their seeds seed in their generations. This is a setting up the partition wall again, betwixt the natural branches, and those that are wild by nature.

2. The manner of gathering is destroyed, and the Lords baptism neglected, and a counterfeit baptism set up in the room thereof.

A. Though this head would require a larger answer, yet I shall contract as briefly as I can, therefore

1 As to the matter of a Gospel Church, it is believers and their seed, which I thus prove: the Church of Christ is his kingdom in the world, to which the tenders of Gospel-Grace and mercy belongs, it is therefore called the Gospel of the kingdom, *Mat.* 13. 19. before toucht upon.

It was so before the coming of Christ, and it is so since. If Grace therefore once took in children to be subjects of this kingdom, who then casts them out? not Grace, for that is unchangeable, and therby they were taken in; Tis the Argument of *Paul*, *If God justifies, who shall condemn*, Rom. 8. 31, 34. *If God be for them, who shall be against them?* If grace makes them holy, by separating them to a holy use, who shall make them unclean, and cut them off? And that the same bowels of Grace and tender affection remains in Christ to little babes is cleer, under the Gospel, *for of such is the kingdom*; he doth not say of such was the kingdom. For that indeed would have been quickly made use of as a plea against us. *But of such is the kingdom*, As if he had said, My Kingdome is made up of the same materials, as the Kingdomes of the World are, not onely of men and women, but of children also, *of such is the kingdome*, would it not be ridiculous to say, there may be a kingdom without children? and that this is a metaphorical allusion, to the kingdoms of the world

is

is cleer, not onely from the words or phraſe there us'd, but alſo from other Texts, *The kingdoms of the world, ſhall become the kingdoms of Chriſt.* And *Abrahams* covenant tells us how it ſhould be, namely, *by multiplying of Abrahams ſeed in all Nations*, ſo as that power at laſt ſhall naturally divolve into their hands, as it is worthily obſerved by an eminent Miniſter of theſe times, Mr *Carter* upon *Abrahams* covenant.

2. Conſider, the foundation of this kingdom was laid in *Abraham* and his ſeed. For though God had his worſhip before, in families, from the beginning, upon the firſt promiſe of Chriſt, yet it came not to a kingdom-worſhip till the promiſe was inlarged of multiplying the ſeed as the ſtars of heaven. And ſo *Iſaac* was taken in as a ſubject with his Father, though but an Infant-ſubject; and that covenant which took in them, was the kingdoms covenant; and the ſeal of the covenant, was the ſeal of the kingdom, which reaches as well Infant-ſubjects, as their Parents. If then the foundation of the kingdom were parents and children, then the building upon that foundation muſt be alſo parents and children, becauſe it is not a new but a continued kingdom, *Mat.* 21. 43. This being duly weighed, it will alſo reach to that other relation, the Church ſtands in to Chriſt, of being *his houſe:* And ſo takes in the place quoted, 1 Pet. 2. 5. *And ye as living ſtones are built up a ſpiritual houſe*, &c: Look what materials therefore were laid into the foundation of Gods ſpiritual houſe, of the ſame is it carryed up, till the top-ſtone be laid; with ſhoutings, Grace, Grace; And that Gods houſe, under the Law, was a ſpiritual houſe, and their worſhippers, ſpiritual worſhippers, is cleer; becauſe *Iſrael* were a ſeparated people, from all Nations; and were alſo to be ſeparated amongſt themſelves, from all moral and typical uncleanneſs; either in perſons or things, in order to a ſpiritual injoyment of God in his worſhip, they being then as we now, to offer up *ſpiritual ſacrifices to God, holy and acceptable*, Se 2 *Cor.* 6. 16, 18. compared with *Lev.* 26. 22: *Iſa.* 52. 11. *Ezek.* 37. 27. *ch.* 44. 7. And, the having children in that ſpiritual houſe, did not at all diminiſh from the worſhip, to make it the leſs ſpiritual, *Iſa.* 56. 7. the alluſion of the ſpiritual houſe under the Goſpel, is drawn from the nature of Gods ſpiritual houſe under the Law, *My houſe ſhall be called the houſe of prayer of all Nations*, It was not ſo called, from the walls and ſtones of the Temple, though that alſo in a ſenſe might be ſo called, but from *Iſraels* meeting there, who was the praying people that God had then in the world, and the children were alſo carryed up to be pre-

presented before the Lord *Exod.* 13.2 *Levit.* 12.1,6. *Luke* 2.22,23, 24,27. Therefore, what ranks or degrees of people there were in the house of prayer then, the same was also the house of prayer under the Gospel in all Nations to consist of: namely, of *men*, *women*, and *children*; therefore the Apostle calls the Church the houshold of faith: in which are taken in believers seed: this doth also answer that place, *Joh.* 4. spiritual worshippers, for such they were under the Law; and yet their children also were included. The word is there used in opposition to this or that place, which they lookt upon themselves bound up to, though Christ was come; as also in opposition to their manner of worship; which was then more carnal, *Heb.* 9.10. Truth was also opposed to the Idol worship of the Samaritans; but nothing at all can be gathered to take away the right of children: or that imports children not to be fit matter for a Church, kingdom, or house of God; especially considering it was the same covenant of Grace then that took them in, as it is now; and if it be an immutable covenant to believers and their seed, as no sound Christian can deny, then are believers seed still in the covenant. And thus also children may be truely called *Saints*, and sanctifyed persons; holy, because set apart to a holy use in the service of God.

3 Whereas therefore he saith, this opinion brings in a whole Nation of believers, it is his mistake; for till God brings them in, the opinion and practice doth not; for it is but the incorporating of the families of believers, into Congregational Societies and Churches, unless there be so many families as fill a Nation, and then I think without offence, they may be called a Nation of believers; and for ought I can see, not improperly a National-Church; neither are we bound by *Israels* practice of Circumcising, to their succeeding generations, who had a command for it, (though I believe they were much corrupted in that Ordinance, as appears from that place, *Ezek.* 44.7.) therefore to baptize our children to succeeding generations, i the Parents wicked, because the visible unbelief of Parents cuts off their seed, and their visible believing ingraffs them in. And thus we finde *John* repulst visible unbelievers that came to be baptized upon the account of *Abrahams* covenant: so that it appears that *M. P.* is a ignoran: of the ground of our practice, as he is of the truth of Li: own

4 Neither is it the setting up again of the partition wall betwixt the natural branches, and those that are wild by nature. For the partition wall was the legal-Ordinances, *Eph.* 2.14,15, given to the Jewish

ſh Nation onely: and ſhutting out all Nations beſides: ſo much is implyed by *Paul*, Rom. 9. 4. *To them appertained the giving of the Law and the Oracles*, that is, to them and none elſe, ſo *Rom.* 11. 12. *Mat.* 28. 19. which Commiſſion was inlarged upon Chriſts taking away that partition wall, and copyed out according to the tenor of *Abrahams* covenant, *Gen.* 12. *In thee ſhall all Nations of the earth be bleſſed.*

Therefore go teach all Nations.

Therefore alſo by natural branches, we are to underſtand the Jewiſh believing Parents and ſeed. Theſe were the branches of the covenant, cut off for unbelief, *His blood be upon us and our children*, Mat. 27. 25. and Rom. 11. 15, 20. *becauſe of unbelief they were broken off*: What, they? The firſt place tells us, Parents and Children; and *ver.* 17. (*and if ſome of the branches were broken off*, implying that as Parent and ſeed were branches, ſo ſome of thoſe branches were not broken off, but ſtill remained in *Abrahams* covenant. Therefore

2. By wild branches, *or branches wild by nature*, we are to underſtand the Gentiles, Parents and ſeed, called wild by nature; becauſe *Iſrael* that were Gods Vineyard, Orchard, Garden, and ſo incloſed, were dreſs'd and prun'd by Chriſt in his Miniſtry, who was the vine-dreſſer thereof, when as the Gentiles grew wild as a Tree in a wilderneſs, and ſo were *without God in the world, thou the natural branches were cut off, That the branches wild by nature might be graffed in.* The Sun at noon day hath not ſo cleer a light, as this Scripture hath to prove the covenant right and intereſt of believers and their ſeed. In what therefore he affirms in pag. 81. that taking in of children is a ſetting up the partition wall betwixt the natural branches, and branches wild by nature, he ſhews himſelf more blind then that poor man that ſaw men as trees walking. For by natural branches he underſtands onely adult profeſſors: and by branches wild by nature, little infants; when as the word of God tells us, that we are to underſtand by branches, Parents and Children. By all which, it is apparent that he underſtands not what the partition wall is, or what the natural branches or branches wild by nature ſignifies. Thus far we have examined the truth of his Church matter. The next thing is the form, Therefore

P. The holding of this opinion that believers ſeed have a right to the covenant, makes people live in a neglect of the Lords baptiſm, contenting themſelves with a counterfeit baptiſm inſtead thereof,

and thus the Church comes to be constituted of good and bad promiscuously; and then he calls for our rule to justifie it.

A. The Reader may here observe, to what height of spirit this man is swelled, that he durst charge all the Churches of Christ through the world, with a counterfeit baptism, as if the onely light of this truth did shine in Rivers. It hath been already proved in answer to his Essentials, that the Lords Baptism was not by dipping.

Therefore believe him not, yea the Lord Christ will be a swift witness against him, that he abhors such a practice, for the reason before laid down. And whereas he saith that it makes the Church a promiscuous body consisting of good and bad: I answer.

1. So doth Christ himself, *Mat.* 13.47. where he likens the kingdom of heaven, *i. e.* the Church, to a net let down into the sea, which gathered of all kinds, both good and bad; yet I hope he will not be so bold, to lay a charge of impuration upon Christ himself.

2 It hath been also proved, that such a mixture as is made by taking in believers and their seed, is no more then what the word of God bars out, upon the account of *Abrahams* covenant: and to call it a mixture is to call that common which is clean.

3 Neither do I believe, but if their own Societies were sifted, there would be found more chaff then wheat, and that their Congregations would not appear more strict then ours; I speak not this by way of boasting, for I doubt, we have not so much cause on either hand.

But let him that glorieth, glory in the Lord.

P. p. 82. He tells us of going in an untrodden path, because we baptize children, and receive them into the Church as members, and yet deny them the Sacrament. And then asks us when we will give it them? or why they have a right to one priviledge, and not to another?

A. Though a child may not be fit to sit at the fathers Table, yet he may be fit to suck at the mothers breasts. And if you will know when they shall come to the Lords Table, the Apostle tells you, when they can examine themselves, 1 *Cor.* 11.28.

Look back to *Israel*, though their seed did receive the seal of the covenant, and were admitted then in Christs kingdom, yet they were not presently fit for the passover, which was also a spiritual feast, and a prefiguration of the Lords Supper, 1 *Cor* 5.7,8. as the *Israel* of God then, in which children were included; was a prefiguration of Gods *Israel* now; therefore though baptism, and the Lords Supper are both priviledges of the covenant, as Circumcision and the Passover were

were then; yet the infant-seed of the kingdom may be fit for the one, though not fit for the other; as the infant-subjects of the kingdoms of the world: they are subjects, but not fit for all the priviledges of a kingdom, which consideration doth answer his cavils; though much more might have been added upon another account. As to that Scripture *Act.* 2. 41, 42. *That all that were baptized continued in breaking bread.* I answer, They were such there spoken of, that were capable of hearing the word, and which gladly received it; that were converted from Judaism. The like to which is practised upon the conversion of any unbaptised persons at this day: and this makes therefore for us, for though their children were admitted in upon the account of *Abrahams* covenant, *The promise is to you and your children*; yet we do not finde they were admitted to the Supper: because the same promise belonging to them and their seed under the Law, yet the seed were not capacifyed for the Passover. By all which, therefore it appears our path lies plain and open, that we may see which way the footsteps of the flock have gone before us; whereas if the blind lead the blind, they both tumble into a ditch or River. And thus both the matter and form of a true Gospel-Church is maintained by our doctrine and practice.

VII. The last head of Fundamentals, which he saith our doctrine and practice destroys, is

P. That persons may have a right to a covenant of life, without an in-being in Christ by faith, and is it not therefore a sad thing, that persons that profess themselves Ministers, and to have knowledge in the Gospel, should be so blinded as to mislead people in so weighty a point as this is, and that they should endeavor to leaven thousands of people with such a sad error as opposeth it self against the substance of the Gospel, *&c.*

A. It hath been the main policy of Satan in all times of Reformation, to endeavor the subversion of the Ministery of Christ, and by all means to make them fall as stars from heaven, because he then knows how to carry on his kingdom, works of darkness. And if *Israel* cannot be overcome when they are united to one God, in one way, in one Commonwealth; he will then divide them, because then he knows his work will thrive in the hands of *Jeroboams* Priests.

We may here see what a heighth the false Prophets of this Commonwealth are come to, that they can without check smite the Prophets of God upon the face, with reviling words, dragon-like, casting a flood of waters out of their mouths, that so their may not escape; we

may doubt such words are but preludiums to a remaining Tragedy. I speak the more in this, because I have also seen a piece called the *Kings of the East*, which may be rather called the devils pleading for a Pulpit; in which, when he speaks to the Ministers for licence to make use of them, he tells us if they will not give leave, they shall be prayed down and pulled down. But I hope they rage the more, because they have but a short time.

But to come to the answer:

What he hath here said, is of the same nature with what he hath spoken before, and so hath been already answered. Before he charged our baptism to be a counterfeit baptism, and here again our Ministers are blinde, and misleade thousands to oppose the substance of the Gospel. What taunting bold language is this, and how unfit for a man of his thred-bare knowledge and profession? I hope the reader will excuse me, because it is to speak a word for those choice leaders of Christs flock; who are as sheep dumb before the shearers of our times.

2. The former distinction of the covenant must be still minded, and then it is apparent, that the charge put in against our Ministery is false. I have been one of their followers above this 12 yeers, I bless God, I never heard such a doctrine delivered: That propagation gave an inbeing in the spiritual part of the covenant of Grace, which is that M. *P.* intends by the covenant of life. Therefore what the Prophet said to *Ahab*, is not mis-applyed to him; *It he, and such like as he, That are the troublers of Israel*, That *leavens* the Nations with errors. *That run before they are sent: for he whom God hath sent, speaks the things of God*; he speaks not the things of God, because he understands them not, as hath been made appear hitherto, he understands not the covenant of Grace from works; what the new covenant is, the extent thereof, how to baptize, or whom to baptize. And therefore with the false Prophets, he teaches to revolt from God and his ways.

The Reader may by this time see, what wood, hay, and stubble he hath built, that not one Argument hitherto, either to prove our practice to overthrow the forenamed Fundamentals, or Circumcision a covenant of Works, hath been made good. Therefore it is evident That they remain unmoveable and untoucht, notwithstanding those horrible outcryes, wherewith he chargeth our doctrine and practice withal, pag. 83.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

The Third general head answered.

P. THe third head propounded to be proved by him, was, that none but believers had or shall have a right to the covenant of Grace; to prove which, he tells us that so soon as the seed of the woman was promised to our first Parents, after the fall, the Lord immediately made an outward covenant of Works, which was typical and intayled upon the flesh, out of which Christ was to come; which was more dark till *Abrahams* days: then till *Moses* more cleer: and then from *Moses* it brake forth cleerly; and so continued till Christ, in whom it ceas'd and ended.

A. That those typical Ceremonies by him called a covenant of works, was part of the covenant of Grace, hath been fully proved; Therefore lets keep the old distinction, and hold fast the form of sound words, to cast off which is of as dangerous a consequence, as to strip the Barke from the Tree, and then let the other grow if it can. Besides, note what must necessarily follow.

I. God made a covenant of works with *Adam*, which he broke.

II. God made a covenant of Grace after he fell.

III. God made again another covenant of Works: so that here is implyed, either

1 That the covenant of Grace was incompleat, and had not a Table sufficiently furnisht, to accommodate all parts of man. And therefore he must be left to a covenant of works for temporals, so to help out what the other wants, or

2 That mans happiness in a state of Grace, was so imperfect and unstable, that he fell back into a covenant of works, or

3 That God after he had made a covenant of Grace with man, upon better consideration, took that away, and re-stated him in a covenant of works, or

4 That a believer, as before observed, may be in two covenants at once, or

5 That God had rather all men should be damned, then saved, *&c.*

6 That upon Christs coming, the conditions of the covenant of Grace, (by him called of works) being abolisht as such a covenant.

Therefore

Therefore, now man either ſtands looſe or free from all Ordinances and Sabboths, or elſe the obſerving the Sabboths or keeping to them muſt be a new covenant of works. Thus it is apparent what a rock of error, and hereſie, we ſhould at laſt ſplit upon, by imbracing ſuch fantaſtical notions as this patron of plunging, would dowſe us into; Therefore let the Reader obſerve that *Heb.* 11. and he ſhall finde the typical worſhip was then made acceptable to God by believing, as our Ordinances are now; which had it been a covenent of works, it would have ſtood directly oppoſed to faith; *therefore it was of faith, that it might be by grace.* But when he ſpeaks of a covenant of works, then, *If it be of works, it is no more of Grace, otherwiſe Grace is no more Grace.* And take alſo a brief touch of the parallel of that adminiſtration, which was the old covenant, and ſo of works.

Then, as before, the Goſpel-adminiſtration muſt be a new covenant of works. And ſo what M. *P.* doth (though onely a pretender to Goſpel-rule) in wading into mill-pools and Rivers muſt be, as indeed it is, a branch of ſuch a covenant of Works. Therefore not of Grace.

P. pag. 87,88. The reaſon why God made choice of *Abrahams* family, and not *Lots*, or any of the reſt of the godly families in the world, it was not becauſe *Abraham* was any more a believer or his Family; for then *Lot* and his family, and the reſt had been taken into the covenant of Circumciſion, becauſe they did believe as well as *Abraham.* For this is a ſure rule, If God gives a promiſe or command to a perſon as a believer; then whoſoever believes, that command and promiſe belongs to them: and for this he brings the example of *Joſhua*, I will not leave thee, which the Apoſtle applyes to the Church *Heb.* 13.5. now the covenant made with *Abraham*, was therefore to ſhew the world that Chriſt muſt come out of his fleſh, *&c.*

A. Though I grant that *Abraham* was not pitcht upon as a believer barely; yet had he not been a believer, he could not have been the father of the faithful.

2 If that had been all, to point out to the world from whence they might expect the Meſſias; then Circumciſion might as well have been given to *Seth*, *Enos*, or *Shem*, &c. and ſo have diſtinguiſht the whole race; yea God muſt afterwards have given ſome diſtinct ſign to *Judah*; becauſe all *Jacobs* twelve ſons were circumciſed. So that the world would be at as great a loſs, to know in which of all theſe twelve the line was to run. Therefore if we do but look into the grounds of the Promiſes, we ſhall finde, there were many other main and

and choice ends; as namely. By the multiplying of believers, as the ſtars of heaven; who alſo are called the ſeed: they might thereby become bleſſings to families and Nations. For as Jeſus Chriſt was the great bleſſing, ſo every believer was alſo to be a little bleſſing; According to the promiſe, *I will bleſs thee, and thou ſhalt be a bleſſing*: and by this means God makes uſe of believers to be as his leaven, *to leaven the whole lump*: ſo that in this way Chriſts *kingdom* ſhall at laſt ſpread through the earth.

2 To make *Abraham* a publike Father, to the believing Gentiles and their ſeed ſince the coming of Chriſt, as he was to the Jews and their ſeed before Chriſt came.

3 To ſeal the poſſeſſion of *Canaan* to him and the heirs of Promiſe as a type of heaven, and to give them poſſeſſion of that Land in a way of conqueſt, *Gen.* 22. 17. *Luke* 1. 73.

4 To ſhew the immutability of his counſel and purpoſe to the Gentiles, *Heirs with him of the ſame promiſes*, that ſo, we in Goſpel days, might have ground of conſolation in all ſtraits and extremities, that the heirs under the Goſpel might meet with, becauſe they alſo have a *wilderneſs* to go through *Rev.* 12. 6: and *Canaanites* to ſubdue and conquer *Gen.* 9. 27. And a like *reſt* with that of *Canaan* to poſſeſs *Heb.* 4. 1. Therefore *Abraham* is held out as a publike Father to look at, thereby to ſee and behold Gods variety of dealings with him, and with his ſeed after him, either in war, or peace; proſperity, or adverſity, hereby to ſtrengthen Faith in the like caſe: that ſo as *David* ſaith, one deep may call out to another at the noiſe of Gods water-ſpouts, when the billows overflow.

Theſe, and all theſe, and more then theſe were the ends for which God made choice of *Abraham* to give the Promiſes unto, with the oath, and ſeal; all which do ſubſtantially continue to this day; being by Chriſt handed over to the Gentiles, with the old ſeal taken off, which as Lord of all, he had power to do, and a new ſeal added in the room thereof, to the ſame covenant, which amounts to no more then the taking off a ſeal of red wax from a covenant, and putting a ſeal of white wax in the place thereof; yet the covenant ſtill *remains*.

II. To that which he ſaith, that if a command or promiſe be given to a believer, as a believer, it then (as a ſure rule) belongs to every one that is a believer.

A. That's no true rule, therefore not a ſure rule; becauſe a promiſe that ſuits to one mans condition as a believer, doth not therefore ſuit

suit with every believers condition: neither doth the end of God, in giving one believer a Promise, reach to the same end in all believers, unless so circumstantiated; as for instance;

God gave *Abraham* Circumcision as a believer. And his end was to make *Abraham* a publike Father: yet this did not therefore reach to all believers. For he did not intend to make any more publike fathers then one; the like we may say of that instance he gives of *Joshua*: The command and Promise given to him, was as a Captain General and believer; and so it could not reach to all believers upon those terms, for though he was commanded to be of a good courage, *&c.* and fight, and he should not be forsaken, yet that command doth not reach to all believers; because we see many believers have fallen in the wars, and their enemies have been the conquerors; yea such a command would then reach to women, because they are believers. And the reason why that promise was applyed to the believing Hebrews, is because one promise hath several aspects. And so suits to several conditions, it being as a sprig of the whole bundle that suits all conditions. So, the several cures that Christ wrought upon persons as believers, and some in a way of promise, doth not therefore instate all believers in such a promise, that they shall so be cured, when the holy Ghost tells us *the prayer of faith shall save the sick*, doth this give al believers an interest into the direct intent of that promise: there is therefore much Christian prudence to be observed in chusing, and applying promises, to pick out such as are suitable to a believers condition.

The Reader may therefore see, how sadly confident and ignorant this man is; who yet, is lookt upon, as the *Nicodemus* of that party.

P. pag. 86. For many pages he goes on to shew that the whole line by promise, mentioned in *Luke* 3. it was onely an external election into a covenant of works, and *Cain*, *Ham*, *Ishmael*, *Esau*, were therefore outwardly rejected from that covenant.

A. It hath been already proved that all the line by promise are more then externally elected; yea so to affirm is strongly to suppose, that some of that elect line might be damned, because thousands so elected are never saved, and some of those so rejected might go to heaven though tis expresly against the scriptures: the naming of which methinks should be a sufficient confutation.

As to the six sons of *Keturah*, which he speaks of in page 90, which were *Abrahams* seed, and sent away into the east Country:

The

The answer is plain, that so long as they were in *Abrahams* family and Circumcised, they were all Church-members and visibly in the covenant, as their brother *Ishmael* was; but being turnd out of the family, they lost the Church priviledges, as not being heirs of promise; as for their being gracious, we have no ground to think they were, but the contrary. And had *Ishmael*, *Esau*, and *Keturahs* sons, been kept within the covenant, there had then been no partition wall betwixt Jew, and Gentile. For the whole Nation of *Israel* came onely from the line of *Isaac:*

P. pag. 91, 92. He tells us that all the Nations of the earth were to be blest alike in him: *i.e.* saith Mr *Patient* in the spiritual covenant. And Circumcision was but a chusing of one Nation into a Church covenant for matter of worship.

A. He cleerly confounds *Abrahams* covenant and blessings, for if all Nations were equally alike blest, as to the spiritual part of the covenant; To what end then should God pitch upon any people or Nation to walk in his Ordinances, when the spiritual part of the covenant was not to be conveyed in them, or if it was, yet upon such terms, that other Nations without such Ordinances, did injoy as much? and then to what purpose should *Israel* be at such pains, cost, and charges in their Offerings, or spend time to hear, read, pray, or keep the Sabboths, if all these were but as shells without a kernel? yea had it not been a burthensom yoak? and might not Gods people have said, why shall we spend so much time, and take so much pains, and be at such costs to worship God, when other Nations that do none of all this, yet they injoy as much of the spiritual covenant, and so of Justification and salvation, yea as much of the world as we?

I appeal to the Consciences of all our dissenting friends, whether this be not to preach up revolt, Apostasies, and backslidings, from the ways of God, and to make the hearts and spirits of Gods people to disrelish them as an unsavory dish? yea such a doctrine as this tells the world, that where God gives Ordinances, they prove a curse and not a blessing, whereas that holy Apostle tells us, *Eph.* 2. 12. *That at that time we were without Christ, aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, strangers from the covenants of Promise, having no hope, without God in the world*; And so *David* Psal. 147. 19, 20. *he hath given his word to Jacob, his Statutes to Israel; he hath not dealt so with any Nation* —— Therefore when God tells *Abraham*, that in him all Nations of the earth should be blest; he intends a time and order for this

bleſſing to work, and not in all at once, nor in all parts at once. And ſo the Apoſtle after argues, *To you firſt God hath ſent his ſon, to bleſs you:* and if the Jews firſt, then the Gentiles afterwards; yea when it came to the Gentiles, there was a divine order in conveighing this bleſſing, falling like the ſhowrs of heaven, ſometimes in one Country, ſometimes in another. Firſt it ſpreads about *Jeruſalem*, then it *Coaſts* up in *Africa*, by means of the Eunuch: then the light grows dark, and out it breaks in *Europe*, *Spain*, *Italy*, *Greece*; afterwards again, when Popery had overſpread the earth, then it breaks out in *France*, *Germany*, *Bohemia*, *Netherlands*, *Denmark*, *Sweden*, *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland*: all which tells us that Gods Ark of worſhip is Ambulatory, not fixt to any place, by reaſon of the wickedneſs of a people, as Chriſt tells the Jews, *Mat.* 21.43. The kingdom of God ſhall be taken from you, and given to another Nation that ſhall bring forth the fruits thereof; the Lord grant we finde it not true in theſe Nations by ſad experience, for there are ſad ſymptomes; and chiefly when reproach and contempt is caſt upon the Miniſters of Chriſt without check or controle: thus then we may ſee what deſperate errors are like to come in at this watergate, if it be not kept ſhut; and all for want of a right underſtanding of the covenant made with *Abraham*: I ſhall not meddle with his typical election; becauſe it runs upon the ſame foot with the former already anſwered: that place by him quoted, 2 *Cor.* 3. of the miniſtring of the ſpirit, meets alſo with the like quarter, by his falſe interpretations of the reſt; for I muſt profeſs I have not ſeen throughout his whole book, any one Text brought but hath been either falſly opened, or falſly applyed.

In pag. 91. He tells us, that *Jacob* in the womb was no more the ſeed of a believer then *Eſau*; which ſhall be eaſily granted, if his ingenuity will but grant alſo that *Jacob* was more the ſeed of Promiſe then *Eſau*; which is a ſufficient anſwer.

P. Pag. 92. 93. He again harps upon the old ſtring thus: Circumciſion was not given to *Abraham* and his ſeed, conſidered as a believer, but to ſhew us that the Meſſias was to come from *Abraham*, not from *Lot*; from *Iſaac*, not *Iſhmael*; from *Jacob*, not *Eſau*; therefore here you may nakedly ſee how groſly they miſtake, that think the covenant was made with *Abraham* and his ſeed, conſidered as a believer, and believers ſeed; therefore if a national covenant was made with *Abraham* and his ſeed upon this reaſon, before, then you cannot conclude that *Abrahams* covenant belongs to any Gentile; becauſe when Chriſt was come, and the ground upon which the covenant was given

ven ceasing, the covenant also ceaseth: so that now to defend a covenant in the flesh, is a doctrine virtually to deny that Christ is come: and hence therefore we may conclude that there was no covenant of grace made with any but such as did and do believe: that objection therefore, that spiritual priviledges under the Gospel, are not less then they were under the Law, is hereby answered.

A. I have here taken in the matter of these pages without mangling as neer as I could, because this eclipse will make truth break out more glorious, and instead of seeing the naked truth, we may see rather his nakedness, and so his shame. Therefore

1 If the covenant had not been made with *Abraham* as a believer, then it had not been made with him at all, as already proved, and so the Apostle tells us he received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith which he had, *&c.* implying that if *Abraham* had not enjoyed that righteousness, he could not have enjoyed the seal of it.

2. Had it been given him barely to proclaim Christ to the world, as to come from him, and so nothing else to be expected from that covenant then as before, there must have been another mark found out to shew, in which of *Jacobs* twelve sons the line was to run. For notwithstanding Circumcision, M. *P.* would be to seek, had it not been for *Mat.* 1. and *Luke* 3. —— therefore

3 We have it laid down before that *Abrahams* covenant in the blessings thereof had many other choice branches: which reaches into Gospel-days since the exhibition of Christ, to the worlds end. For which cause *Abraham* is called the Father of believers under the Gospel, which could not be that we should be *Abrahams* children, If the blessing of *Abrahams* covenant reacht onely to Christ, as pointing at him; for so we must have been Christs children, not *Abrahams.*

4 Then the Apostle knew not what he said, *Gal.* 3. 14. when he tels the Church, *That Abrahams blessing is come upon the Gentiles through Christ.* For if it were onely meant of Christ, then it would lose the title of *Abrahams* blessing. But though Christ be come, yet the blessing is *Abrahams* blessing still: yea Christ is come, that he may conveigh the blessing from the Jews to us, as heirs with them, and not distinct from them: and what blessing it should be, called *Abrahams*, which Christ should hand over to us, if not the blessings of the covenant in all the veins thereof, is not to be understood. Therefore

5 As the promise, oath, and seal, were joyned together to make the blessings of *Abraham* sure, so were they all conveyed to us intirely, *to shew the immutability of his counsel, and purpose to us*, as it did to the Jews, *Heb.* 6. 18. that so the heirs of *Abrahams* promise under the Gospel, might have strong consolation. And upon this account it was the Apostle in *Rom.* 4. bids them cast an eye back upon *Abraham* their father, to see how he was justifyed, which had it not been so, they would have been sent to Christ as a pattern, not to *Abraham*; He should have been called their father, not *Abraham*: so, when he tells the *Galatians*, ch. 4. 28. (in order to rectifie their judgements in the like mistake of Justification) now ye brethren, as *Isaac* was, are the children of the promise. It had been to no purpose, unless *Isaacs* promise had remained, for they could not be children of that which was not. From all which we see into what mistakes he is got, and how sadly bewildered with his own notions, & upon what slight promises, he draws so high conclusions to make his ware vendible. For notwithstanding any thing he hath spoken, as *Abrahams* blessings and covenant do not cease, though Christ be come; so neither do we deny by this opinion of ours, that Christ is come, or do we expect another Christ to come, as he suggests. It therefore appears, the covenant of grace is of such extent, that it takes in thousands into the visible part thereof, that shall never be saved; so that still the objection which he saith is answered, remains in full force and vertue, that the priviledges are not straitned more then they were under the Law: therefore as children were then in covenant, and received the seal, so are they still in covenant, and the Gospel seal is their due, and cannot be denyed them.

P. Pag. 94. The new covenant was confirmed of God in Christ onely, *Gal.* 3. 17. therefore it cannot belong unto any souls out of Christ, 1 *Cor* 11. 25. This cup is the new Testament in my blood: If the New Testament be in Christs blood, then what hath any carnal unbelieving wretch to do with this Testament, that hath not faith in his blood?

A. These Texts makes full against him. For that place, *Gal.* 3. 17. tells us that *Abrahams covenant which was* 430 *yeers before the Law, was confirmed in Christs blood. Therefore the Law coming after, could not make the Promises of God of none effect*: If then *Abrahams* covenant in which children were included, were confirmed in that blood; this new covenant being the same with *Abrahams*, as himself confesseth, and confirmed by the same blood, Infants are still within the same

same covenant. For the covenant is in Christ, Yea and Amen to all the persons included in the covenant. As there is a double being in the covenant; internal, and external: so a double being in Christ, *Joh.* 15.3,4 which being well distinguisht, will clear all such doubts. Some of the seed are onely in Christ externally, as *Ishmael*, *Esau*, and others; Internally also, as *Isaac*, *Jacob*, &c.; and so in the covenant, whether Adult or Infants: the like to be said to 1 *Cor.* 11.25. That cup is the New Testament, or a seal of the New-Testament to all that are within that Testament. As Christs blood typically sealed the first Testament to *Abraham* and his seed, so Christs blood seals the New-Testament to believers and their seed; of which that cup is the Sacramental remembrance: the like also to *Mat.* 3.17. my son in whom I am well pleased, *i. e.* as God was well pleased with *Abraham* & his seed by promise, that were in the covenant confirmed by Christs blood; so is he now well pleased with believers, and their seed by promise in the same covenant confirmed by Christs blood. The same answer is to be given to all the rest of those places by him quoted, with which he fills many pages, to prove that none can be in the covenant of Grace except he be first in Christ.

P. In pag. 91. He condoles the sadness of these times. That when the means of grace, and knowledge of the Gospel, is so plentifully held forth; yet we must be forc'd to bestow such pains to prove that men cannot be in a state of salvation, and acceptation before God in a covenant of Grace, without union with Christ by Faith.

A. Alas poor man, he would fain be pitied for the pains he takes, but who is it that puts him to it, but his own erring spirit which makes him afraid of his own shadow? Is there any of us that affirms so wickedly, that acceptation is to be had in God, without union with Christ? If not; he deals the more deceitfully to suggest such things, as if our Ministry did it. Therefore

2 Whereas he saith the means of Grace hath been plentifully held forth: It seems it is not by his opposites the publike Ministry. For how can such hold forth the means of Grace, that shall affirm such an acceptation is to be had without such an union? which he affirms to be the principles of those that plead for infant-baptism: but blessed be God, if you have no better warrant to justifie your irregular and unnatural practice withal, and condemn ours, then such calumnies; the experience of these days speaks aloud, who it is, that have held forth the means of Grace, and glorious light of the Gospel.

spel. It is evident enough from the budding and fructility of *Aarons* rod, of whom it may be said, they preach with Authority and not as the Scribes, for their rods are dry and barren; because they preach not conversion, but subversion.

I shall touch upon a Scripture or two more, leaving the rest for the Reader to answer in his own thoughts. For indeed not one of them proves any thing he asserts; *Joh.* 14. 6. *Mat.* 7. 14. He that hath Christ hath life, he that hath not Christ hath not life; we say the same: but he that hath not Christ spiritually, may have a visible right to the covenant of Grace, as those hypocrites had, so often mentioned. So in their own.

P. So he quotes *Joh.* 16. that Christ calls the unbelievers in the national Church of the Jews, the world; *I have chosen you out of the world*; and their being circumcised, freed them not from being justly so called.

A. The answer is, The words are directed to the Disciples, as a people that acknowledged Christ exhibited, and so were Gospel worshippers. And the unbelievers amongst the Anabaptists may as well be called the world, if the comparison relates to one that truely believes, as the Jews were called the world, when Christs words related to his real believing Disciples. For the denying of Christ to be the Messias, was that which distinguisht; because such a denyal led them to keep up a form of worship, that did directly oppose the Gospel.

P. Another Scripture *Rom.* 4. 16. *It is of faith, that it might be by grace*: but if the covenant was made to the seed; it could not be of faith, and so not of grace.

A. Here is sad work made in his interpretations: was it not of Faith to *Abraham*, that it might be by Grace, to him and his seed? for shame abuse not the Scripture so grosly; *It was of Faith that it might be by grace, to the end the Promise might be sure to all the seed*; and who this seed was, he tells us, *little children*, if we may draw it from *Isaacs* being a child, in *Isaac* shall thy seed be called. And because the Gentiles shall know that the word *seed* reaches them, therefore he adds, not to that onely which is of the Law, &c. So that as it was *to Abraham by faith, that it might be of Grace to his seed*: So is it now of Faith to a believer that it might be of Grace to his seed.

So also he quotes *Act.* 15. 4. *He put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.*

A. If

A. If God put no difference, how durst he do it then?

P. So *Gal.* 3. 2, 4. *We are all one in Christ Jesus.*

A. How then can he answer it before God, to make us twain? For as *Abraham* and his seed through the Law, were in covenant, so are believers and their seed now: or else we are not all one in Christ, but two seeds.

P. As for that opposition he gives page 99. That a temporal election into a temporal covenant, was a type of the spiritual election into a spiritual covenant:

A. It is a whimsey of his own brain, that can never be made good, and therefore it shews a giddy spirit after notions. ——

P. Again, *Heb.* 11. 6. *without faith it is impossible to please God*; therefore none can be in a covenant of Grace but such as believe. So *Abel.*

A. We please God by Faith now, as those worthies in that chap. mentioned did then; for therefore the Apostle brings in them for an example: so the answer is still the same. Look how *Abraham* our Father pleased God, in circumcising his seed as in the covenant, in which there was an act of Faith, and how the contrary in *Moses* neglecting the seal displeased God; so are believers to please God by sealing their seed, and the neglect hereof provokes the wrath of God, as it is evident from this example: by which we see that if we would please God as *Abraham* did, we must then walk in the steps of *Abraham:* and it is agreeable, and not opposite to faith, or grace, to seal our Infants.

Thus Christian Reader, thou maist see all the Scriptures by himself quoted to maintain his opinions: they do like the stars of heaven in their courses fight against this *Sisera.*

P. The last place is *Rev.* 21. 8. *The fearful and unbelieving shall have their portion in the lake of fire.*

A. Is not this well applyed to the thing in hand, or doth he with one blast of his Nostrils turn all children to hell? The Lord rebuke him; even the Lord.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

The 2 Act. 3. 1 Cor. 7. 14. vindicated in answer to his last general head.

Pag. 101, 102. WE are now come to his last head, to examine the answer he gives to our Scripture Allegations, and accordingly to reply. The first Scripture he quarrels with is *Act.* 2. 39. *The promise is to you and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* ——

P. To which he saith, the promise is just to so many as God shall call; and by Promise, he opens the remission of sins, and gift of the holy Ghost, and then he makes this flourish; I pray take notice how evident the Text makes against this error. That the covenant of Grace should be made with the fleshly line of believers; and to confirm the meaning of the word *call* in his sense, he brings *Rom.* 8. 30. and *Heb.* 9. 15. and 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. All which speaks of an effectual Call.

Rep. We are here to consider to whom the words were spoken; 1. namely, to the Jews who were troubled in spirit about their condition, such who had crucified Jesus Christ; that had wisht his blood to be upon them and their children, *Mat.* 27. 23. *The promise is to you and your children*: this promise cannot be meant of the gifts of the holy Ghost, by tongues and miracles; for that would have been no solid cure to a wounded conscience, as theirs was. *Judas* had such gifts, but they could not make his conscience whole, who was guilty of the same sin.

2. This Promise was to relate to them afar off, that is, the Gentils; it could not be therefore such Gifts, for they ceast in that age, and the Gentiles afar off never had them, though yet the Gentiles did repent and were baptized: therefore by this promise, called the promise, must be meant such a promise which they well knew, and were acquainted with; and therefore must be *that of Abrahams covenant, made to him and his seed.* So the Apostle, Gal. 3. *To Abraham and his seed, were the promises made*: ver. 16. *not seeds as of many, but as of one*, i. e. the Jewish seed, and Gentile seed, make but one seed *i. e. Christ mystical*, in his political body, 1 *Cor.* 12. 27. So here again the promise is to you and your seed.

Quest. *But what was there in Abrahams promise to cure a wounded conscience?*

Conscience? For such were the persons mentioned: therefore the salve must be suitable.

A. All good things were in it, that related to Grace or Glory. I will be thy God, what could be said more? what promise will cure a wounded Conscience, if this will not? Tis a salve most proper to the ground of their distemper, they had crucifyed God the Son. And this promise tells them, he was theirs notwithstanding. For the words *I will be thy God*, imply *personal promises*: so the father saith, I will be thy God: and the Son, I will be thy God; and the Holy Ghost, I will be thy God; a promise sufficient enough to bear up a sinking world, suitable to *Gal.* 3. 14. explained v. 8. before to be in order to their Justification, the thing these Jews wanted; so that *Abrahams* covenant conveyd in the bowels of it, justification by faith to sinners, & so most suitable to the distemper. The promise is to you and your children.

2 Consider wherefore these words are brought in, namely as a strong inducement to repent and be baptized; and so it lyes in the form of a Motive for the Promise, *&c.* As if he had said, Let this incourage you to repent and be baptized, for the promise is to you and your children, *i. e.* you shall not onely injoy blessings, but your children also, if you embrace the Gospel: For the Apostle very well knew with whom he had to deal, and what Arguments would be most prevalent with the Jews, and had not this been the meaning of the Holy Ghost, the putting in the word *children*, had rather proved a rock of offence, and a stone of stumbling. For what could the Jews imagine upon a free tender of Grace to them and their children, but if they did repent and were baptized, the extent of *Abrahams* promise should be the same as formerly it was to them and their seed? especially when it came in their own Scripture dialect? *The promise is to you and your children; And to them afar off, even as many as God shall call:* —— therefore. 3 To cleer this latter part from this absurd interpretation which M. *P.* gives, that the promise is restrained in the whole v. when he saith, Even so many as God shall call —— I

A. With Mr. *Sidenham*: we have in this verse an exact distribution of the world into two parts Jews, and Gentiles; and to these two parts the Apostle distributeth the promise. Onely he restrains it, when he speaks of the Gentiles afar off (For so they are called *Eph.* 2. 12, 13.) in bringing in these words, *Even* so many as the Lord our God shall call; which words cannot be referred to the former part of the verse, for in that he applyes the promise to the Jews and their children in the present Tense, because they were then under the

call of the Gospel, as if he had said, Repent and be baptized now, whilst you have grace and mercy tendered; for the promise is to you and your children; but when he comes to speak of either the *Ten Tribes*, as M. *P.* will have it, or the Gentiles, he turns the Tense into the future; because they were yet afar off, and not called; the promise is to them also, *as many as God shall call*. So that if this clause should limit the whole verse, then to what purpose should the Holy Ghost bring in the word *children*? for that had been superfluous, because Jews and Gentiles comprehended the whole world. And then the words must have run thus: the promise is to you Jews, and to them afar off, as many as God shall call: or if the word children be kept in, as the Holy Ghost hath plac'd it; then thus: the promise is to you Jews, when God shall call you; and to your children, when God shall call them; and to as many as are afar off, when God shall call them; might not they have replyed, why what need all this Tautology? If the promise belongs to us upon our being called, and to the Gentiles upon their being called; you need not tell us it belongs to our children upon their being called: for we knew that before. But therefore the word *children* is kept in to shew the special priviledges God hath given them when the parent is converted. And then the sense runs cleer, Repent and be baptized, *For the promise is to you and your children*, and to them that are afar off, *even as many as the Lord our God shall call*, in a smooth Honorable stile becoming the Gospel: thus we see, that rather then he will make his sense stoop to Gods word he will make the Holy Ghost stoop to his Non-sense.

From which therefore we may gather (notwithstanding his insinuating perswasions, that this Text makes against us) it is abundantly cleer that this promise here spoken of, is that of *Abrahams* covenant, which the Apostle *Gal.* 3. explains to be a Gospel-covenant, and was confirmed by Christ 430 yeers before the Law: so that still the result amounts to this, That if it be *Abrahams* covenant, it must convey the blessings of the covenant to all within the covenant, that is, to the spiritual seed, spiritual blessings; to the temporal seed, external priviledges onely: but still by one covenant.

IV. To come to the Scriptures before brought: his intent thereby was, to prove that the promise of remission of sins, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and so justification to life belongs to all those which God shall call.

A. He errs, not observing the Scriptures, nor the distinctions thereof. Gods call is two fold, *External*, and *internal*: yet so as that the latter

latter is conveyed in the former: and sure a man must needs grosly mistake, to affirm that all that are called are justifyed, and their sins remitted: for then *Judas* had been justifyed, and *Simon* the Sorcerer saved (for they were both called, and both baptized) yea all that are called everywhere to repent, would then be justifyed; and all those Apostates that are in these days fallen from the truth, would be all saved, for they were all called; so the foolish virgins were called.

2. Let it be considered, that the promise of *Abrahams* covenant is here held forth. Now all that are visibly called to embrace the covenant, are not effectually called; though nevertheless all that are effectually called are within that covenant. The Church at *Rome*, *Corinth*, *Galatia*, *Ephesus*, the seven Churches of *Asia*, were all called visibly within the covenant, but we know they were not all effectually called; we may then still see how sadly M. *P.* mangles the Scriptures, when he brings proofes that relate to an effectual call, to prove that all that are called (without any distinction) shall be justified and saved: so that if he can but finde out the word *call* in a Text, 'tis enough: no matter how it is applyed.

P. Pag. 130. This Text is cleer to prove that those Jews and proselytes that then heard him, and their children also, the ten Tribes, and Gentiles afar off, the promise did belong to so many of them, as God should call; Therefore except soules be given up to a spirit of delusion, will any dare to affirm that the promise of the spirit and remission of sins, and eternal life do belong to any other? or will they be so ignorant to judge those promises did belong to the generation of the Jews, though they were called or not called, &c?

A. We never affirmed that remission of sins, or eternal life belonged to any but such as are effectually called; therefore the spirit of delusion and ignorance, yea the spirit of impudence hath seized upon him, so to affirm. But this we say, that all that are visibly called to embrace the tenders of the Gospel by a visible subjecting thereto, are within *Abrahams* covenant: for we cannot imagine that all the Apostles baptized were really called: for the Sorcerer before mentioned, doth sufficiently confute it; therefore still he mistakes the question, which is thus, whether all that are called are really justifyed?

2. Neither can it be reasonably thought, that there were no hypocrites amongst those three thousand mentioned, and that they were all so called as he speaks of; but the Apostles intention was to let them know, by what way they might get in to *Abrahams* covenant again, from which both they and their seed were cut off; *Therefore*

Repent and be baptized, for the remission of sin; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is to you and your children, &c. That is, remission of sins, and the gift of the Spirit comes still in the way of *Abrahams* Covenant, as it did before, *Gal.* 3. 14. Therefore if you will get into the way of the Spirits working; you must repent and be baptized: he doth not say that all baptized do really repent; for upon the ground Mr. *Patient* goes, none should be admitted to baptism but such as really Repent, and are really called, and really justifyed; when as yet he forgets his own ignorance, That he is not able to discern them. Thus we have sifted all his cavils brought against this Text, as not to countenance Infant-Baptism. And upon the whole we finde it to be a tender of *Abrahams* Covenant, in all the blessings of it, even to children of visible believers, either Jews or Gentiles; Therefore the seal of that Covenant is their due Right and Priviledge.

P. The next Text is, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. which he saith we abuse, to make it speak for Infant-holiness. *Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy.* God takes persons into Covenant two ways, either by an external typical Covenant of Works, as he did *Israel*, and so a people may be said to be holy by separation, as the carnal Jew being separated from the world: and thus the vessels of the Temple were holy, and the Priests were holy.

2 Secondly, A new-Covenant-holiness when God writes his Laws in the heart, and sanctifies their Nature; and there is no other kinde of holiness that relates to the new Covenant but this; Hypocrites may have this in appearance, but the Elect onely have it in truth; therefore it is impossible, that a believers carnal seed should be so holy by Birth. And no other sanctification the Scripture speaks of, belonging to the new Covenant. The other was abolisht by the death of Christ.

A. Whereas he knows no other holiness belonging to the New-Covenant, but real holiness; it is rather an Argument of his ignorance, then any confirmation of the truth of what he saith, for that New-Covenant had such a holiness of separation belonging to it from *Adam*, to Christ. And it is the same that we have, onely the holy things are changed: yet so, as that whatever Ordinance God hath given his Church now is holy.

Israel

Israel as separated from the world, was a holy people, so is the Church of God now, *Act.*10 11,28. 2 *Cor.*6.17. Therefore the Apostle writing to the Churches as separated people, calls them Saints or holy ones, at *Rome*, *Corinth*, *Galatia*, &c.

Not that they were all holy by an internal work of sanctification, for the Romans had many that were fallen to Judaism, and *Corinth* had many profane persons amongst them; yet as they were a Church they all carry the denomination of holy ones: so that the Church stands upon the same terms of separation now, as then, from the world. Therefore the casting out of the incestuous person, was as one *polluted* and unclean, which is opposed to such a holiness as makes a person fit for Church-Communion: Thus also it was with *Israel* when there was either a *Moral* or *Typical* uncleanness, they were cast out as not fit for Communion: thus the bread and wine in the Lords Supper, and water in baptism, are holy by vertue of separation or institution: thus the *function* of the Ministery is holy, or else every man might preach, baptize, and administer the Supper alike. And notwithstanding ceremonies are abolisht, yet a holiness of separation by vertue of divine institution remains still, or else the word of God were no more holy then another Book; Nor the Gospel-Sabbath more holy then another day: thus are the Infants of a believer holy, else *were your children unclean, but now they are holy*: yea let me add, that it is impossible that any man can be found in the faith, and amongst the rest Mr *Patient* for one, either to Scripture Sabboths, or Gospel-Ordinances, except they grant *a holiness of separation*, both in persons and things. ——

P. The words are grounded from *Ezra* 9. and *Deut.* 7: It being an expres Law for a Jew not to marry with a stranger: therefore they were to put away their strange wives, because not lawfully marryed; and the children that were born of them were to be lookt upon as illegitimate. The Church upon this writing to the Apostle to be resolved whether such of them as had unbelieving yoakfellows, might dwell together, and whether it was not unclean or unlawful; To this he answers, Let them dwell together, because now there being no Law against it, the marriage was therefore justifyable, and the unbelieving wife is sanctifyed to the believing husband, that is set apart by the Law of marriage to him onely; else were your children bastards, but now they are lawfully born. ——

A. There

A. There is no such thing mentioned in either place, that their children were Bastards. Then had *Moses* son by *Zipporah* the Egyptian been a Bastard; yea the contrary is evident, because the Scripture calls them wives. And is it not a wilde expression to call her whore, that Gods word calls a wife? And would it not be as strange, to think that so many Priests and Levites should be whoremasters, which yet must be, if such an interpretation were true, as Mr. *Patient* gives?

But therefore the ground of putting away their strange wives, was because *Israel* was a separated people, and so not to have any affinity with strangers. And though it was *Israels* sin, to marry a stranger, yet it was not their sin to match with an Israelite, which had it been whoredom, the very light of nature would have condemned it, besides, this scruple did not lye betwixt Jew and Gentile. For this was a Gentile Church, a people converted from heathenism to profess Christ.

They had therfore no ground to think that the marriage they had before conversion was unlawful. And had the taking in of the believer into communion with the Church, made the unbeliever a whore or a whoremaster, and the children bastards, or had any such ground of scruple been given, it had been enough to have frightened the heathens from being Christians. It cannot be therefore that any dis-satisfaction should rise in their spirits from those Texts by him quoted, considering also the nature of the phrase, the wife should be sanctifyed in the husband, and the husband in the wife; a strange word to be used amongst heathens, that every marryed couple were sanctifyed one to another: so likewise to put the word *Holy* in opposition to uncleanness of birth, is too high a tearm, and such a way of speaking as is not to be found in Scripture. Adding this likewise, that the holy Ghost would have spoken so, as not to be guilty of tautology, for then the words must have run thus: *Else were your children bastards*, and there it would have broken off, because the next words had been superfluous, *but now they are holy*: so that by this we see, what an unseemly unbecoming interpretation he gives, and what indignities he puts upon the spirit of God, whereas if we look upon the words in that other sense, wherein is implyed a federal holiness by *Abrahams* covenant, which ever hath taken in Parent and childe, it is a strong Argument inducing to imbrace the Gospel, and carries with it a full sail of comfort to godly parents, Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy. Thus also this place stands immoveable, notwithstanding any thing he hath said or can say to the contrary.

contrary. If therefore children are holy, by vertue of *Abrahams* covenant, then you that are believers, get into the fold of Christ, that your children may receive the seal of the covenant, baptism, which is the mark of the flock.

CHAP. XVI.

Rom. 11. *vindicated from false glossings.*

Pag. 110. THe next place he opens is *Rom.* 11. 16, 17. but with what evidence of truth will be seen, when it hath undergone the Test: If the first fruits be holy, the lump is also holy; if the root be holy, so are the branches.

P. He grants that by root is meant *Abraham*, but yet in a double capacity; *Abraham* as considered in the covenant of works. And so working *Abraham* is the root of all the natural branches: and so legally holy, as *Abraham* was, who was the first-fruits, and the natural lump, was all *Israel* so holy, till that covenant of works was abolisht by the death of Christ, and then this covenant being put an end to, it must needs be, that such branches who were onely natural must be broken off.

2 *Abraham* is to be understood a root, considered as believing *Abraham*, in a spiritual covenant, and so in this sense holy: and thus onely the spiritual branches are said to be holy; and by lump also, must be understood all the spiritual seed, in this spiritual covenant: these distinctions duly noted, will inlighten the soul to understand the place.

Rep. These are wild notional distinctions, and not to be found in Scripture: it hath been already proved; that *Abraham* as a believer had never two covenants made with him, nor is there the least word of two covenants in the chapter, any farther then that grosse mistake of the Romans, who were looking after a justification by works; as thinking the Law had been given by God to make men righteous legally: these distinctions therefore of believing *Abraham*, and working *Abraham*, a spiritual root, a carnal root, *Abraham* in a covenant of works, *Abraham* in a covenant of Grace, a carnal and spiritual lump, instead of inlightening the soul to understand the place, rise like a dark smoak out of the pit of error, that the truth is not to be seen in them: therefore I may say of him, as it was said of *Reuben*; Thou

art

art the first-born unstable as water, thou shalt not excel; the vanity of such stuff will appear by this that follows.

1 If *Abraham* in a covenant of works be the root from whence the natural branches are broken off; then the Gentiles that are ingraffed are put into a covenant of works; because the Apostle cleers it, that such who are ingraffed, are put into the same stock from which the other were taken *ver.*17. and calls it a graffing in amongst them. So *ver.* 19. they were broken off, that we might be ingraffed.

2 Then also when God shall re-ingraff the Jews, they must be put into *Abraham* considered in a covenant of works, and so the covenant of works must continue till this day; because there cannot be an ingraffing where there is no stock, *ver.*24.

3 If the covenant of works be made the root, or *Abraham* in that covenant, then the casting off the Jews from that covenant could never be called the reconciling of the world, because the world could not be reconciled by a covenant of works, and that the world was reconciled by that covenant is cleer, *ver.*11.

4 If the covenant of works now be ceast, since Christs coming, as he implyes, the Gentiles could not be ingraffed into the spiritual part of the covenant, till that was taken away; which indeed he having confest in page 114. doth hereby contradict himself in what he hath before affirmed, pag.91. with many other places, that *Job* and *Jobs* friends were all in the spiritual covenant, which was made as well to all nations as the Jews, and they had as much benefit thereby as had the Jews.

5 If the ingraffing of the Gentiles, be to be understood onely of the spiritual lump as he saith, then also is that spiritual lump ingraffed into a covenant of works, from whence the natural branches were cut off. For none of that spiritual lump of *Israel* were ever cut off, as himself confesseth: thus we may (briefly) see what execrable stuff he introduceth by such wild notional distinctions.

P. In pag.15 he explains, *Isai.*65.23. *They are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their off spring with them*, which saith M. *P.* is meant onely of the righteous off-spring, *i. e.* such as are in the spiritual covenant.

A. It is strange that a man should be so wilfully ignorant to give a sense of Scripture so directly contrary to the scope and Analysis thereof. For by off-spring is to be understood Infants, as will appear by viewing the scope of the place, which speaks of the conversi-

on

on of *Israel* into that Gospel-state, that shall be called the *new Heavens*, and *new Earth*: when they shall be brought to re-inhabit their own land, under the Messias, and enjoy the fruit of their labours; And gives this as the reason why they should rejoyce with God, and God with them, *Because they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their off-spring with them.* As if he had said, though you and your off-spring have been discovenanted and cast off from being a people, scattered upon the face of the earth; yet as you and your off-spring were the seed of the blessed of the L. *i.e.* of *Abr.* to whom all blessings were given; so you and your off-spring shal be as much ingrafted in all the blessings of *Abraham*, as you were before, *For they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their off-spring with them*: which place doth fully parallel *Rom.* 11. when God shall ingraff the Jews again as natural branches, into their own Olive-Tree.

P. p. 116. This Text *Ro.* 11. doth fully make against any fleshly covenant, or fleshly line of believers, because from ver. 20, to 24, the Gentiles come to be *Abrahams* spiritual seed, and so branches onely by faith in Christ, the fat Olive. And if the Gentiles are grafted in contrary to nature, then it cuts off all Gentile-seed who came in by nature. And though the Jews were cut off for unbelief, yet this opinion doth ingraff the carnal seed of the Gentiles into the midst of that unbelief.

A. That by natural branches is to be understood the Jews and their children; and by branches wild by nature, the Gentiles and their children; hath been already proved. See the answer to pag. 82. And that the cutting off and graffing in, related to Parents and children, hath been also cleered. To which I refer the Reader, onely adding, *Jer.* 31. 1. *Isai.* 65. 23. therefore to interpret by natural branches, only adult believers, and by branches wild by nature, the Infants of believers, is to restrain and eclipse the intent of the Holy Ghost in the place cited, and supposeth strongly, that all such adult believers are really ingrafted into Christ: When as Christ himself tells us, there may be some branches in him cut off and withered, *Joh.* 15. 2, 4, 5, 6. And that Infants are all damned, because all wild by nature.

2 Where he tells us of ingraffing into the midst of their unbelief, is false; for we ingraffe into that stock, *Abr.* from which they were cut off for unbelief. And if what he asserts in this, were true; then those believing Jews and their children, which were not cut off, remain in the midst of their unbelief, that were cut off. And thus we may see a man in his nakedness, and yet without shame. I see I must pass

over many of his absurdities, and reiterations; because they come so fast upon me. In pag. 118 he again runs retrograde.

P. If any hold believers and their seed within the covenant of grace, it is a denying of Christ to be come in the flesh; and therefore he must needs be a high Antichrist.

Rep. This hath been already answered, and his vain confidence so to affirm hath been manifested, that it is apparent if the Reader will but take pains to view the answer to his 93 page, it is no denying of Christ to be come in the flesh, to maintain Infants right to the Covenant of Grace; yea it is a strong Argument to prove Christ is come, because the blessing of *Abraham* is by Christ handed over to the Gentiles, *Gal.* 3.14. which could not have been, if Christ had not been exhibited in flesh; because the wall of partition could not have been broken down; therefore M. *P.* lies under self-condemnation, because to deny the blessing of *Abrahams* Covenant to be handed over to the Gentiles and their seed, is to deny Christ exhibited, as that place of *Paul* proved, *Gal.* 3.14. so that M. *P.* proves himself an Antichrist.

Let no man therefore dislike the truth for this Bears skin which this Author of dipping hath cast upon it. For it is the devils policy now Antichrist is falling, to cry down all Gospel-truths for Antichristian, that so they may fall also; but manger all the malice of hell, the interest of Children in the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*, shall stand and triumph, as a glorious truth of the Gospel, when Antichrist and his children, all petty Antichrists shall tumble together.

P. Pag. 118. He quotes, 2 *Cor.* 5.16. *Henceforth we know no man after the flesh: yea though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth we know him so no more*, which he explains thus: men were known and approved as priviledged persons in Gods Church, after the flesh; but henceforth we know no man, no not Christ himself as interessed in the covenant of *Abraham*, he being a Minister of a better covenant then that of Circumcision, grounded upon better promises, *&c.* therefore we know no man after the flesh, no not Christ himself.

A. As all other places of Scripture hitherto brought, have been abused by false explications, and applications, so is the intent and meaning of this Text much wrong'd, and clouded: I shall therefore briefly cleer it.

The Apostle is telling the Church of *Corinth*, that the Jew had no more benefit by the death of Christ then the Gentile; for both Jew and Gentile were all under sin, and were therefore all dead, *If one dyed for all, then were all dead.* It seems many of them thought, that because

cause Christ came from the Jews, therefore he did bear more love to them then the Gentiles; and so it was good being a Jew. To which *Paul* answers, True, if we that are Jews should judge after the flesh according to our natural affection to our own Nation, then we should say so too: but the love of Christ constrainous to judge otherwise, that is, he did not look upon the benefit of this or that Nation peculiarly; but this Christ had in his eye, Jew and Gentile were all dead: and upon this account did Christ die. *For if one dyed for all, then were all dead*: as if he had said, Christ did not intend this Jew should be more priviledged then that Gentile, though himself were a Jew: *therefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh*, That is, we do not now look upon the Jew, to have any more priviledge then the Gentiles, *yea though we have known Christ after the flesh*, that is, though we have known him to be a Jew, and to receive the seal of their priviledges only, *yet henceforth we know him so no more*, that is, we have no more priviledge now by Christs coming from us, then the Gentiles; nor hath Christ any more income of priviledges from us, then he hath from the Gentiles; ours is alike from him, and his is alike from us, and no difference. And that this is the true intent of the words, see v. 17, 18, 19, 20. *Old things are past away*, i. e. old priviledges, that we claimed in Christ before others, they are all now conveyed over to the world: and therefore *he hath committed to us the Gospel of reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself*, i. e. It was onely our Nation that was reconciled, before Parents and children called his sons, spouse, off-spring, heirs; the blessings of the covenant were ours onely. But now all this is tendered to the world, *Therefore we as Embassadors in Christs stead beseech you to be reconciled*. And thus you have this innocent Text which hath been turned against *Abrahams* seed (though it harbors not a harsh syllable to babes) wrested out of the paw of the Lyon.

2 Let us view the second part: Christ himself should not be minded as at all interessed in *Abrahams* Covenant, he being now a Minister of a better Covenant, &c.

A. It hath been already fully proved, That *Abrahams* Covenant in all parts thereof was a full and compleat covenant of Grace, and not of Works; Therefore M. *P.* to say Christ should not be minded or known in that Covenant, is as much as to say, that Jesus Christ is not to be minded as Mediator; for there is no other Covenant that he is Mediator of but that; and if this be not a bird of prey that flyes in the Region of blasphemy; Let God Almighty and his people judge.

Thus we may see what work ignorant men will make in preaching, that have onely a little Conscience, a great deal of Confidence, and a great Concordance.

This place also (notwithstanding any thing he hath said) doth vote for the ingraffing of believing Gentiles and their seed into the covenant made with *Abraham*, from which the believing Jews and their seed were cast out, therefore (*Job.*38.2.) who is this that darkens counsel by words without knowledge?

CHAP. XVII.

1 Cor.10.1,2,3: *with many other Texts cleered from his corrupt interpretation.*

P. Pag.120. THe next Scripture he faceth, as intending to relieve it out of our hands is, 1 *Cor.*10. 1,2,3. *Moreover brethren, I would not have you ignorant, how that all our Fathers were under the cloud, and were all baptized to Moses in the cloud, and in the sea, and did all eat of the same spiritual meat, and did all drink of the same spiritual drink. For they drank of that rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ.* This is another Scripture made use of to prove a covenant of salvation to run in the flesh.

Rep. This Text was never pleaded to prove a covenant of life in the flesh; for as we never affirmed such doctrines, so is this Text impertinent, for such a purpose; but this we say, that this Scripture is by us brought to prove the manner of baptising not to be by dipping; so that we see he hath mistaken the door like a blind man groping in the dark; therefore I shall wave much like stuff that follows upon it.

P. Pag.120.121. *Israel* was baptized to *Moses*, a typical Mediator, not to Christ, which is a main passage to be noted; and the covenant that *Moses* was Mediator of, was a covenant of works: and then he shews how the Law did type out in that administration, our deliverance from sin, death, hell, the devil, and what resemblance it had of these things, *&c.*

A. Though *Israel* was not baptized into Christ exhibited; yet as *Moses* was a type of Christ, so they were baptized into Christ, *Act.* 3.22.

2. The Apostle holds forth *Israels* Baptism as a Sacrament, and brings it in with the Manna and the Rock, which was Sacramentally Christ;

And

And compares these two, to the Sacraments of the Church of *Corinth*: *who did eat the same spiritual meat, and drink the same spiritual drink.* So that Christ was as truly held forth in *Israels* Baptism Sacramentally, as in the Church of *Corinths* baptism, and as much in the Rock and Manna amongst *Israel*, as in the bread and wine in the Supper, amongst the Church of *Corinth*.

3. The Apostle by telling the Church of *Corinth* of *Israels* Sacraments and deliverances they injoyed from God [they were all baptized, and did all eat] compares them with this Gospel-Church, as an equal parallel, to let them know, that as they had equal priviledges, so the same since in a Gospel-Church, would bring down the same judgements; as it did already begin to work for their unworthy receiving the Supper.

Now their priviledges being compared as equal, and yet, *Israel* being all baptized Sacramentally into Christ, men, women, and children, doth cleerly import that the infant-seed of that Church, to whom this example is brought, were also baptized into Christ, or else the parallel could never hold: so that what was done in baptising *Israel* to *Moses* as a typical Mediator, was but a prefiguration of what should be done to Gods people *Israel*, *i. e.* men, women, and children, under Christ the true Mediator; therefore this which he lays down mainly to be observed, that *Israel* was not baptized to Christ, is observed to be untrue: And as for the manner of baptising, either by sprinkling, or powring forth water; it is as fully held forth in this Text (as before proved) as that they used wine in the Supper. But of this he speaks but little: though indeed it is the main thing for which this Text is so often cond.

P. As to that where he tells us, *Moses* was a typical Mediator of a covenant of works.

A. Then is Christ a Mediator of a covenant of works, and then he contradicts what he affirmed in pap. 127. where making *Abrahams* covenant to be of works: he tells us that Christ was not now to be considered or eyed, as a person interessed in that, but a better covenant. And how a covenant of works can stand with a Mediator, or a Mediator with such a covenant, is to me a paradox, and not to be known I am sure on this side the water.

P. Those Teachers mentioned in *Act.* 15. that would impose a yoak upon the disciples necks, were much like to those now, who plead for Infant-baptism. For they had no warrant for what they did.

A. He

A. He appears mistaken: for our Ministers now, neither plead for Circumcision nor Justification by works, which was the main rock, those primitive Churches (by reason of the false teachers) were like to split upon; yea it is a thing note-worthy, that in all those primitive revolts from the truth, the false Teachers did usher them in, by preaching up Circumcision, after the Law of *Moses*; by which means they made rents and divisions in all Churches; so that, had not Infants been Church-members, that were strongly riveted in their Parents affections, it could have been no taking Argument to Parental-members, to fall back to Judaism, or any probable ground of hopes to incourage the false Teachers in their works: for upon the strain of Anabaptists they might have done as they pleased, with their children Circumcise, or Paganize them; for they were not to be of the visible Church til they were adult believers, and so converted to the Faith by the word preacht. And the very Text it self doth imply that children in the Primitive times were called Disciples; or else how should it be called a putting a yoak upon the necks of the Disciples, after the manner of *Moses*? It was the childrens necks, that bore the yoak; *Zipporah* knew it right well: so that it is apparent, what he saith of our Ministery in comparing them to those false Teachers, is but his usual way of reproaches, in which he shakes hands with those false Teachers mentioned, whose main work hath ever been to smite the shepheards, that the sheep may be scattered; and to extinguish their light, that so their glow-worm shining may be seen in the dark. But I hope the light of these times, with the barking of the wolves now abroad, will sufficiently discover them to be beasts of prey, though they go mantled in sheeps cloathing.

P. p. 124. This being premised, that *Moses* was a Typical Mediator; and their baptism, and the Rock, and Manna a type of Christ: from hence the sense of the Text is drawn plain, That as the spiritual disciple or Israelite is baptized into Christ, so the temporal Israelite was baptized to *Moses* in the cloud and sea: and they are called spiritual meat and drink by a figure.

A. He hath no way to put off his false doctrines, but by turning all Scriptures into allegorical notions: for what exposition he hath here given is as much besides the Text, and as unlikely to be true, as for me to say, the man in the Moon is like M. *P.* for let us but consider, that those Sacraments were spiritual to *Israel*, as Gods Church, as the Sacraments of the Gospel were spiritual to the Church of *Corinth*. Now the Apostle in drawing the parallel, doth not speak of a spiritual Church

Church in a carnal Church; or a ſpiritual Iſraelite, and a carnal Iſraelite; thereby making onely ſome to be baptized to *Moſes*, but tells us plainly they were all baptized to *Moſes*. Whereas, this whimſical notion would make us believe, there were ſome of *Iſrael* not baptized to *Moſes*: and when *Paul* ſaith, *they did all eat the ſame ſpiritual meat, and did all drink the ſame ſpiritual drink*; M. *P.* tells us directly contrary. You ſee then with what evidence of truth he ſpeaks, when the Authority of an Apoſtle muſt vail before him: and though he ſaith the Sacraments are ſpiritual by a figure; yet if he were askt by what figure, he muſt either give a Parrots anſwer, or ſay nothing; albeit he ſhews his ignorance to be medling, and his confidence (I am unwilling to call it worſe) to notionallize the Sacraments themſelves, as if they were not a ſpiritual meat, and a ſpiritual drink to the Church of God. By which we ſee, rather then he will have any dependance upon the Law, he will run beyond the Goſpel.

P. p. 127. Thoſe typical ſignes and figures then, which typed out Chriſt to come, did properly belong to the typical ſeed, the body of *Iſrael*, that typed out the ſpiritual ſeed to come, in Goſpel-Ordinances inſtituted ſince Chriſt came, which are for confirming, that he is come: and theſe belong only to the ſpiritual ſeed in whom Chriſt is come already, dwelling in their hearts by Faith.

A. Here is ſuch a pack of diſtinctions, that were not (I believe) heard of in paſt ages. It ſeems the ſpiritual *Iſrael* had no need of Ordinances; for they did not properly belong to them, but to the carnal lump: and why then ſhould *Abel*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, and all the ſeed by promiſe, be ſacrificers? why then ſhould *David* cry out after thoſe water brooks, and even envy at the happineſs of thoſe birds who had their neſts neer the Altar?

2 If the body of *Iſrael* did type out the ſpiritual ſeed to come under the Goſpel; then whom did the ſpiritual ſeed of *Iſrael* type out? either no body, or by oppoſition the carnal Goſpellers; for the ſpiritual *Iſrael* were types; though yet the carnal *Iſrael*, or the body of *Iſrael*, it will be hard to prove them types, eſpecially in that nature, unleſs they were types of the Roman Apoſtaſie.

3 If temporal *Iſrael* did then type out the ſpiritual *Iſrael* now; then their Apoſtaſie, backſlidings, divorce, and caſting off, muſt type out the divorce, apoſtaſie, backſlidings, and caſting off the ſpiritual ſeed.

4 If the carnal ſeed in thoſe typical Ordinances did type out none but ſpiritual ſeed to be admitted to Goſpel-Ordinances; then all that

that are now Church-members, muſt needs be ſpiritual, and ſo there are no hypocrites now in the Church: Let the world judge whether this is not wretched ſtuffe, which yet is the natural conſequence of thi. unnatural diſtinction:

P. 128. It was not neceſſary, that all that were Circumciſed ſhould believe and repent, and ſo be firſt made Diſciples: but Baptiſm is a confirmation of our Regeneration and our New-birth, and Union with Chriſt by Faith: And therefore belongs to them only, that are regenerated and born again of water, and the Spirit: ſo the Lords Supper, Let a man examine himſelf, *&c.*

A. It was neceſſary that *Abraham* ſhould be a believer, before *Iſrael* could be circumciſed. For had not *Abraham* believed, there had been no ſuch ſeal given to his family; as is already proved.

2 (To let paſs his Tautologies as the leaſt of his offence) If baptiſm belongs onely to ſuch as are regenerated; why was *Judas*, *Demas*, *Magus*, and thoſe *Act.* 20. 29, 30. baptized? or how ſhall it be known who is new-born? or can it confirm Grace where there is none? what confirmation was it of the New-birth to *Judas* and the reſt? ſurely his words muſt admit of a large charity, to think that all that are dipt have truth of Grace confirmed in them thereby.

P. Pag. 130. The carnal Iſraelite was as capable to perform every Ceremonial Law without Faith, as truely as the Believers:

A. A man had need of a belief of the biggeſt ſize alſo to credit this; for the true performance of thoſe typical Sacrifices was not barely in the work done, but when the worſhippers had an eye to Chriſt, which the true believer then, ever had. For the main ingredient to make that worſhip truly performed, was Faith then, as it is now; and he might with as much truth ſay, that he that is formal in Goſpel-duties, either in prayer, hearing, receiving, doth as truely perform them, as he that is a true believer. It is to me a moſt unſavory expreſſion, and ſuch looſe ſtuffe, that ſurely if there be any cloſe walking. Friends to the truth, they cannot but reprove ſuch looſe doctrines.

P. Ibid. There is no leſs then a profeſſion of Faith required in the Church of *England*, before baptiſm; and therefore this doth juſtifie what we hold, and condemn what they practice.

A. He begins now to flye low, to ſeek to ſtrengthen his feeble practice, by the Liturgy and Canon of the Church of *England*; who before doth ſeemingly rejoyce, that he is converted both from their doctrines

doctrines and practice, but what if they do hold that profession of Faith and Repentance, should precede baptism? so do we all. And as Faith was to *Abraham*, and is to us the condition, by which all our seed is taken into covenant with the Parent: so baptism seals the covenant, and upon this ground *Peter* moved his hearers to be baptized: he backeth the motion, not barely from their own interest in the promise, as personal believers; but upon the joynt interest of their children with them, upon their Parental believing, *Act.* 2.38,39. *Repent and be baptized, For the promise is to you and your children*: implying that the covenants sealed, should run as largely as the covenant. As it was to the grand covenant Parent of all the heirs of promise: i. e. *Abraham*. Thus all *Noahs* children were baptized in that typical baptism, with their believing parents in the Ark, *1 Pet.* 1. 3,21. *Gen.* 7 1. which was upon the same covenant-account, that *Abraham* and his seed were circumcised, and that a parental covenanting faith doth reach the seed; so as to incorporate them into external priviledges, Gods carriage to *Moses*, when he neglected his duty to seal his child, doth sufficiently evince, *Exod* 4.2,4,5,6. and agrees with *Gen.* 17.14.

2 Faith and Repentance is required also upon a personal account to initiate such as come to yeers, that are converted to imbrace the Gospell, as Jews or Heathens, or any other unbaptized persons. But therefore I hope that since he hath brought this instance, he will afford them to interpret their own meaning, which they have best done by their practice, though it may be not so orderly as he ought. However we cannot but observe in this as in the like, by searching after Antiquities, and quoting the presidents of antient Churches, and wracking the books and meaning of the Fathers, as *C. B.* and others have done, they would gladly get some humane Authority to countenance their Innovations. But their fingers have been knockt off from that by worthy Mr *Cobbet* of *New-England*, that I believe they do not much care to plead humane Antiquities more.

P. 31. If the covenant of life belongs to all believers seed, then we need not want for Church-members; because all the world are the children and off-spring of believing *Noah*: therefore this Argument carries the right of covenant to all the world, because they are the children of a believer.

A. We do not baptize believers children for want of Church-members, but because it is an Ordinance of Christ. And though all the world be the off-spring of believing *Noah*, yet what he affirms is

untrue, that therefore *Noahs* Faith carries the right of covenant to all the world, upon these reasons.

1 Because God did not pitch upon *Noah* to make him the Father of the Faithful, as he did upon *Abraham* to whom he gave the promises, *Heb.* 11. 17.

2 Therefore as children, we are to acknowledge him to be our father, that God hath made to be so, which is faithful *Abraham*, to whom he gave the seal, and not faithful *Noah*. And had God pitcht upon *Noah*, as he did upon *Abraham*, no question but *Noah* had circumcised his son as *Abraham* did, but

3 Had God chosen *Noah* as he did *Abraham*, yet it follows not, that all the world could claim a covenant-right to the seal, because all the world were not heirs of promise, as we see, the seal continued not in the race of *Ishmael*; because discovenanted, though yet he was a son of *Abraham*. For upon the same ground, M. *P.* argues all *Abrahams* off-spring to the worlds end should have been circumcised. But therefore Faith ingraffs, as unbelief cuts off: by all which we see how vainly confident he is, in what he saith and affirms: Thus the honor and reputation of that Text 1 *Cor.* 10. stands untoucht. For indeed whatsoever he hath brought thereupon, with which he fills twelve pages together, is but meer impertinences; because he hath taken a wrong aym from the Text.

CHAP. XVIII.

The cleering of Mark 10. 13. *about children being brought to Christ with other Scriptures.*

THe next place he pretends to meet us in by way of encounter is, *Mark* 10 13. *And they brought young children to him that he should touch them. And his Disciples rebuked them that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: For of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein.*

P. The first thing to be considered is, whose children these were, whether of wicked or godly Parents; but by the former discourse in the chapter, it should seem they might be wicked and ungodly Parents, because there was such mentioned before that tempted Christ.

Rep.

Rep. Be sure ill will never thinks well, and his ground to think they were wicked, is non at all; for how often doth one and the same ch- in Scripture speak of three or four distinct things that have no connexion with each other, the subsequent having no dependance upon preceding discourse? it is needless to give instances, the Scripture is full thereof. But

2 That they were believing Parents, consider these grounds: First they were such, that in those days did visibly own Christ, and if we consult *Mark* 10. fully; It was not long before Christs Passion, when he had many enemies abroad. And therefore danger might ensue such an action. And who would adventure to abide the frowns of great men for Infants, were it not their own Parents, and such also that had a face heavenward? Again he

P. Consider also wherefore they were brought to Christ, it could not be to baptize them, because Christ himself baptized none; therefore it was probably to cure some bodily disease or distemper, for the text saith, he laid his hands upon them and blessed them.

A. We never brought the place to prove that Christ baptized them; but to shew the abundant love, care, and good-will, that Christ bears to such little ones; especially to take such into his kingdom. And for him to say or think, that it was to cure them of some disease, is strange. For why then should such words be added? why then should he take them up into his arms? why should it be called a blessing them? it is a word too high for a common cure, yea to think the Apostles should keep any off from Christ, that came to be cured of diseases, smells too much of unchatitableness. It is cleer therefore they were brought to Christ for a blessing, which though it were not baptism, it might be for confirmation after baptism, for it is likely they were baptized by *John*, because the place where it was done, was in the coasts of *Judea*: where *John* had before been baptizing; which also gives some more probable grounds (I say no more) that their Parents were godly; because as *John* pointed at Christ in ad ministring the Ordinance, so we finde these taking notice of Christ accordingly: and that there was imposing of hands after baptism, consider, *Act.* 8. 17, 18. *ch.* 16. 6. sure it is Christ would have us learn something from that carriage of his, that Infants are capable of covenant-blessings, for in that channel all blessings run By which it is apparent that we have the stronger ground (especially, if to it be added a finger of Charity) that their Parents were not onely godly, but the children had been before taken into *Abrahams* covenant.

And the seal thereof, as will further appear in the next. ———

P. For of such is the kingdom of God.

Now it is doubtful whether these children had believing Parents to the fift or sixt generation; therefore if you make it to countenance that error of the covenant in the flesh: that appears erroneous, in that the greatest number of believers children never belonged in that sense to the kingdom of God. *Adam* had a *Cain*, as well as an *Abel*. *Noah* had a *Ham*, as well as a *Shem*, *Abraham* had an *Ishmael* as well as an *Isaac*, *Isaac* had *Esau* as well as *Jacob*; and so through the Scripture, God brings forth a generation of wicked from the godly, and a generation of godly from the wicked indefinitely.

A. That we have good grounds to judge their parents godly, hath before been made appear: but if this were all the difference, methinks a sober is more becoming then a censorious judgement. — By kingdom of God we are to understand the *visible Church*: most properly of such is the kingdom. For otherwise it had not been a suitable reproof, for their offence, in that it lyed in their not suffering children to be brought to him to receive an outward favor and blessing. They could not have hindered them from the kingdom of glory, but from the visible Church they might; therefore Christ takes them up roughly, Suffer them to come unto me, and forbid them not. In which there is a double command, implying much heat of spirit against such an action, and much love and tender affection to the babes, as if he had said, do you that are my disciples reject them, because they are children? I would have you know for time to come, they are as capable of blessings as your selves. *For of such is the kingdom of God*; my church & kingdom is made up of such, as well as of men and women. Methinks Christ here looks with a chiding countenance upon the Anabaptists of our times, who are guilty of the same offence.

II. *P.* But how wide is that which remains, from the business, where he saith the greatest number of believers seed never belonged to Gods kingdom, when as we know the very instances by him cited, do sufficiently prove, that the seed of believers, though they have proved vile and wicked, yet they did belong to the visible Church and kingdom, till by casting out they were discovenanted. Did not *Cain* belong to the Church as well as *Abel*? see *Gen.*4.3,4,5. *Heb.*11.4. So in *Noahs* Family, were not *Ham* and *Japhet* as well baptized in the Ark, and so members as well as *Shem*? was not *Ishmael* as well a Church-member in *Abrahams* family as *Isaac*; so *Esau* the like as well as *Jacob*? These are his own examples, by which we see from the very first

first preaching of the Gospel, the seed of believers have ever had a visible right of Church-membership, till cast out; and of such was the kingdom, and saith Christ of such is the kingdom: so that if the kingdom was of such, and is of such, then for shame acknowledge them to be subjects.

P. If children be admitted into the kingdom of God, by vertue of a covenant of life made by faith and generation, then this crosseth the doctrine of the New-birth, *Joh.* 3 5.

A. The contrary hath been already proved; for if that were true, how came that doctrine of the New-birth to be taught in *Israel*, by the place cited? and yet their seed were then admitted Church-members, as now. I refer the Reader to my former Answer to the third fundamental. As for the making a covenant of life by birth, we abhor it, as hath been often said; it is onely a visible right we plead for, and that which they ever had.

P. p. 135. The place before cited is explained by *Mat.* 18 3,4,5,6. *He that offends one of these little ones that believe in me*, where it is spoken of children in grace, *and whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall not enter therein*, that is, such like in grace as these in nature.

A. That the words are spoken of Infants is cleer, for Christ took a little child and set in the midst of the disciples, and tells them that such did believe.

2 The resemblance cannot hold, for children are pettish, cross, and froward by nature, therefore that example had been very unsuitable, but Christ shews the right such little ones had to the kingdom; because they had faith, *And whosoever receives not the kingdom of God as a little child*; that is, as a little child receives it; cleerly implying that such children are capable of receiving admission into the kingdom. Therefore it doth not at all relate to a parity.

P. And whereas he afterwards tells us, to expound it of believers adult, is most agreeable to the Analogy of faith, and that the whole Word of the Lord disclaims the contrary, as destructive to Gods truth:

A. The Analogy of faith hath ever taken in children into the Church, and kingdom; therefore his high language is but like a flash of lightning, and fitter to take with children and boys, then with men of Reason and Conscience: What he hath said hitherto hath been examined, and not a word in Gods book makes against it. But the whole tenor of Scripture with much pleasant harmony doth agree

to

to give believers seed a name in Gods house. And whereas he saith such a practice destroys the truth of God, it hath been also sifted, and it pleads to his Charge, Not guilty.

CHAP. XIX.

The Word Administration *carpt at by M. P. justifyed, and answered and cleered.* Gal. 4.

Obj. p. 137. *But this which you call a covenant of Works consisting of temporal Promises, Laws, and Statutes, is to be understood of a form of administration of the covenant of Grace, and not a distinct covenant of Works.*

P. I know this Objection some bring, but if it be well weighed, it is inconsistent with their own Arguments, for if that be true, then was there no covenant made with *Abrahams* seed, but onely the administration of a covenant; therefore ill do they affirm, that the covenant was made with them; therefore the Administration. This Objection is false and groundless, as appears by several expres Texts of Scripture which do evidently prove it two distinct covenants.

A. He here quarrels with the word *administration*, because he understands it not, for though it be so cald, by reason the spiritual part runs therein, yet it loseth not the name of a covenant; because it is mans part of the covenant, and called Gods covenant; and yet it is Gods administration to man. For his grand mistake is, in that he thinks the covenant of grace hath no conditions, but absolute; the contrary to which is before proved. The Rainbow in the clouds is called Gods covenant, *Gen. 9.* As here circumcision is called his covenant, but surely M. *P.* will not deny but it is an administration, wherein Gods favor to the world is manifested; how else can it be called a token of the covenant, and a sign thereof; as also is circumcision called a sign and seal, and token of the covenant. And when God saith this is my covenant, he means not a distinct covenant from the other; but that part of the other which related to mans duty. And so it was Gods Administration Office to the world. I need not stand much upon this, because it is so fully spoken to before, in proving circumcision no covenant of works. For the leprosie that overspreads all his book, ariseth from that. I shall briefly touch upon this word *administration*, to shew the propriety thereof, as used in the Objection.

Objection. The Apostle *Paul* in 1 *Cor.* 12. useth the same word in the same sense, there are differences of administration, that is, one legal, the other Gospel, but the same Lord. He is there shewing the different estate that was betwixt Jew and Gentile in the things of God; and therefore when he speaks to the Corinthians in ver. 2. he speaks so as that he would have them understand the difference, betwixt true and false worshippers, *ye know brethren that ye were Gentiles carryed away to these dumb Idols, even as you were led.* But afterwards having shewed that Christ was to have a mystical Church-body in the world, which was to consist of Jews and Gentiles; he tells us that in the compleating of this body there are different administrations; yet so as that both Jew and Gentile are baptized by one spirit into this one body. So that those words, *different administrations*, can relate to no more sorts of people, but Jew and Gentile: and therefore can be but two: namely the Jewish or legal Administration, and the Gentile, or Gospel-Administration, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit of God working in both of them; and yet so, as that the Jews and their children, and the Gentiles and their children make up as one seed, this one body of the mystical Church: ver. 12, 13, 28. *Gal.* 3. 14, 16. compared; and this different Administration came from Christ as Lord; therefore called the same Lord, implying that Christ as Lord gave *Israel* that typical Administration, and so Christ as Lord changed it, and set up a Gospel-Administration: and in this sense is Christ called the Lord also of the Sabboth-day; cleerly implying that what change hath been made of Sabboth-seals, or any other Ordinances, it was done by the Prerogative-Royal of Jesus Christ, as Lord thereof; for the use of that one body and Lordship of his (the Church:) by which we see there are two, and but two Administrations; which therefore as it may satisfie M. *P.* in the significancy of the word, and yet remain as a covenant also; so doth it meet with that licencious rotten abuse of this word, in making as many several administrations as there are new opinions in the world.

P. p. 138. He brings many Scriptures to prove that Circumcision is cald a covenant, not an administration, *Gen.* 17. 7, 13. *Heb.* 8. 6, 7, 8. *&c.*

A. Though God calls it not an administration, but a covenant, yet it becomes a covenant made with man by vertue of administration, and the meaning is no more but this, that Grace to man runs through those Ordinances. If Circumcision be a covenant, it must have an administrator, or else the covenant ceases. If it be a covenant to *Isaac*, then *Abraham* must administer it; so baptism is an Ordinance, yet had

had it no administrator, it would cease to be an Ordinance: it is true there may be a neglect of an Ordinance, as there was of Circumcision, and yet the Ordinance continued, for they wanted not an administrator.

2 Though God called it not an administration in *Gen.*17. yet *Paul* called it so in 1 *Cor.* 12. as is before proved, and surely M. *P.* will not deny, but that *Paul* spake by the spirit of God when he so called it.

3 Tis also called an administration, in reference to the care and pains Gods people are to take in administring for their Fathers estate, left in a way of Will and Testament, which is to be made sure into that *administration-office* of Gods Ordinances, both then under Law, and now under the Gospel; according to 2 *Pet.* 10, 11. *For so an entrance shall be administred abundantly into the everlasting kingdom.* By all which therefore we see the word is proper, full, and significant, only carpt at out of ignorance: that it remains to be a covenant, *i. e.* on mans part and an administration, *i. e.* the way God hath appointed to convey justification to life, and both these reaches Parents and children.

As for all those Scriptures he here brings to prove two covenants, and therefore one of works; they have been already answered, to which I refer the Reader, onely I shall take in one or two Scriptures in which he hath made sad work, that have not been so fully answered before, because I intended it for this place. The first is

Pag 140. Gal.4.21. *Tell me ye that desire to be under the Law, Do ye not hear the Law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free woman; but he who was by the bond-maid was born after the flesh, but he of the free-woman, was born by promise, which things are an Allegory*, i.e. by these things other things are meant. *For these are the two covenants: the one from Mount Sinai in Arabia, which gendreth to bondage, and answers to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free: which is the Mother of us all. Now, we brethren, as Isaac was, are children of the promise: but as then he that was after the flesh, persecuted him that was of the spirit, even so it is now; but what saith the Scripture? cast out the bond-woman, and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free: so then brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free.*

P. From hence observe, that *Abraham* is here a type of God, and his two wives, *Sarah* and *Hagar* with their two children, are a type of the two covenants, and the two seeds in those covenants, and both

continued

continued in *Abrahams* house together for a time. But when *Isaac* was born and *Ishmael* was found scoffing, then *Sarah* the free-woman, will have *Hagar* and her son live no longer in the house with her and her son.

Again *Abraham* had first the free woman, and last the bond-woman; the free-woman was sometimes barren in *Abrahams* house, the bond-woman was fruitful; the mystery of all is this: First God made a covenant of Grace, which proved barren.

Secondly, He made a covenant of works in his Church, which proved fruitful; that had abundance of seed which became his by nature without Faith, all which time the covenant of grace and works agreed well together in Gods house: but when the true *Isaac* was born. *i. e.* Christ; without strength of nature, but by faith in a promise; yet still grace and works as two covenants dwelt together: but when Christ is weaned *i. e.* come into the Ministery, then all the sons of *Hagar*, the old covenant, *i. e.* the Scribes, Pharisees, persecuted Christ, and all those in him: whereupon the free-woman or covenant of grace doth testifie, that the covenant of works with her seed, shall no longer remain in the Church of God, but onely the children of the free-woman born by faith in a promise, must for time to come remain in Gods house, *therefore now rejoyce thou barren that bearest not*, the covenant of grace is become fruitful in all Nations, and therefore *Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all*; and that us or we, *i. e.* members of the Primitive Church be formed, from above by faith in a promise.

From hence it is plain, there were no carnal babes in the Church: but when Christ the true seed of grace was persecuted by the Jews; the seed of the covenant of works, the Gospel, doth plentifully hold forth the abolishing thereof, and casting out those bond-children out of the Church of God.

Rep. To shew the vanity of all this, we must track him by due parallel, by which we shall see the mysterious depths of confusion he is run into; after which I shall briefly cleer up the Apostles intent from that Scripture.

1 If *Abraham* stands here as a type of God, and his two wives as a type of the two covenants: then as *Hagar* brought forth *Ishmael* to *Abraham* a type of God; So must the covenant of works bring forth by strength of nature, children unto God; and those children are as truely the sons of God, as those born by promise: as *Ishmael* was as truely son to *Abraham*, as *Isaac*.

2 As *Abrahams* affection was, that *Ishmael* might be the son of promise, so is it Gods desire that the seed of the covenant of works should be the seed of promise.

3 As *Hagar* and *Sarah* lived together in *Abrahams* family a type of God, till *Ishmael* scoft *Isaac*, so shall the two covenants and their seeds dwell together in heaven, till the covenant of grace be scoft at, by *Hagars* seed.

P. Secondly, When he comes to explain himself, then saith M. *P.* God made a covenant of grace which proved barren, and then a covenant of works which proved fruitful, as *Abraham* had first *Sarah*, then *Hagar*.

A. Did not God know the covenant of Grace would prove barren?

2 Because that covenant proved barren, therefore the other covenant was given to God that he might have seed, as *Hagar* was given by *Sarah*, to *Abraham* that was the type of God.

3 To make *Abraham* a type of God here, is to make him a creature: as God made the two covenants which were to be as his two wives; so *Abraham* made *Sarah* and *Hagar*. I hope when M. *P.* comes to review his work, and to consider what gross wickedness follows, in making *Abraham* the type of God; he will blush at his own boldness, blindness, and ignorance.

P. Thirdly, When Christ the true *Isaac* was named, *i. e.* came into the Ministery, then the Scribes and Pharises persecuted Christ, upon which the free-woman or covenant, cast out the bond-woman and her sons, *i. e.* the covenant of works and her children by nature, which was the National Church of the Jews.

A. All this while he hath carryed on the parallel of the two covenants, till he hath cast out all the Jews and their off-spring, that pleaded a right to *Abrahams* covenant in the flesh: but M. *P.* forgets, that the Apostle tells us *there was some never broken off*, nor never cast out, *when as some of the branches were broken off*, Rom. 11. 17. and he forgets that *the natural branches*, i. e. the Jews and their children, *shall be taken in again*, ver. 24, 25, 26, 27. which must be therefore into the old stock, or root, which remains.

P. Fourthly the free-woman or covenant, doth now testifie that the bond-woman, *i. e.* the covenant of works and her children, shall never remain in Gods Church now; but onely the children of the free-woman shall remain in Gods house.

A. By children of the free-woman he understands real and true

believers

believers: so that the inference riseth thus: that in the Gospel-house and Church of Christ, there shall be none that belongs to the covenant of works, thats abolisht, and the seed cast out, that now the Churches are all Saints, are all heirs, all free-born, no hypocrites; and thus what *Paul* writ to the Romans, Galatians, Philippians, and tells us that in those Gospel-Churches there were many under that covenant, and yet Church-members, is by M. *P.* reproved for falshood, for the free-covenant of grace had cast out the covenant of works and her seed long before.

P. Fifthly, *Now rejoyce thou barren that bearest not*, the coverant of Grace is become fruitful in all Nations; therefore *Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all*, i. e. of us the primitive Church born by faith in a promise.

A. The Reader may remember he hath often before told us, that the spiritual covenant of grace, as it did not run upon intail, so was it made indifferently to all Nations, and that it was not confined to the Jews. For in that spiritual covenant, all Nations had a like share and benefit, *in thy seed all nations are blest*. Now if that be true, then this is false. For what cause hath the barren covenant of Grace to rejoyce now, more then it had of old, for she had her seed in all Nations then, according to the intent of promise: or if this be true, what he hath said before is false; so that take it which way you will, he is judged out of his own mouth.

2. To that other part, consider how many hypocrites there were in the primitive Church, *Judas* with his followers often mentioned; were these born from above by faith in a promise? thus then his own Conscience may by this time tell him, he hath been deceived and deluded in the opening of Scriptures. *Abraham* was no type of God in it is *Gal.* 4. but held forth as the father of the Church-seed, *v.* 22. And so *Hagar* brings forth children to *Abraham* as well as *Sarah*; the true intent of this place appears to be this

The Apostle in this chapter brings this Allegory, to convince those Galatians, which having imbrac'd Christ, were fallen back to the Law Ceremonial, and to seek for justification by works. And therefore he calls them fools, and tells them they were bewitched to fall back from Gospel Ordinances, to the Law; from the spirit, to the flesh; from liberty, to bondage, *ch.* 3. 11. *v.* 1, 2, 3, 4. and having used many pressing Arguments in the preceding chapter, he at last comes in with this example of *Sarah* and *Hagar*, to shew that as *Hagar* when she thought to mistress it, was cast out of *Abrahams* family; so

So the Law ceremonial, when made a covenant of works, and the Law moral also, in that abusive sense was to be cast out of the Church of God, both under the Law, and under the Gospel. But as *Sarah* was contented to have *Hagar* dwell with her a servant, so in that sense did the law ceremonial & moral attend grace, being in truth the Law of Christ. But as a covenant of works, it could not make one heir of promise; Therefore it was but a foolish thing for the Galatians to think by works to merit heaven: for there was never any man saved by works, *ch.* 3.11. But if your hearts and affections be set that way, it genders to bondage, and makes you fruitful to hell, & so leaves you under the curse of God, *v.*24.25. look upon *Jerusalem and her children*, that is, upon all those amongst them, that lived under the works of the Law, and were mistaken, as you are. Are they not all in bondage? and doth not Gods wrath lye upon them at this day? ver. 25. Then again look the other way, *See to Jerusalem which is above*, the Church in heaven, or the Church that hath her conversation in heaven, she is free, she got heaven by faith, and was justifyed by faith, and not by works; she is our mother, ver.26 so before *was not Abraham our Father justifyed by faith?* And here, *Is not the Church our mother got to heaven by faith?* And what, shall we think to be justifyed by our works? No saith *Paul*, it is a mistake; for *the desolate*, i. e. the Gentile-Church, *shall have more children then the married wife*, i. e. the Jewish Church: therefore let the Gentiles rejoyce rather, and be thankful that God hath made them more fruitful then to fall back to a covenant of works: and then again he brings in *Isaac*. Look to him, *For as he was, we are children of promise*. As if he had said, we are to look to *Abrahams* covenant, and how the promise was made with him, and his seed. The present condition of this Church resembles that family: though he had many children; yet there was but one *Isaac*, to whom the covenant was conveyed: therefore away with this Justification by works, cast it out, it will not make you heirs, *so then brethren we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free*. Thus you have briefly the natural meaning of the places; after all those unheard of parallels, and confused constructions, wherewith it hath been intangled, to make it speak for a knocking of that little *nail* of *Infants* out of that sure place of Gods house.

The next Scripture that falls in to be considered, is *Act.*13,45,46. *when the Jews saw the multitude, they were filled with envy, and spake against those things that were spoken: then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold*

and

and said, it was necessary the word of God should be first spoken to you; but seeing you put it away, and judge your selves unworthy of everlasting life, Lo we turn to the Gentiles; for so hath the Lord commanded us.

P. From this Text it is cleer, that when Christ the true seed was persecuted by the Jews, and the Gospel rejected; all those children of the covenant of works were cast forth of Gods Church; the Apostles having left them.

A. Though *Paul* and *Barnabas* had left the Jews; yet *Peter, James and John, who were the Apostles of the circumcision, Gal.* 2.7,8,9. had not left them, but continued; therefore this proves nothing at all, for the discovenanting of children.

2 Suppose they had been wholly left by the Apostles, and so were all in bondage with their children (as thats the drift of his words) then their rejecting the Gospel, which caused the Apostles to leave them, was the ground of theirs, and their childrens falling into bondage. The Apostles bringing that Gospel to the Gentiles, supposeth that upon the imbracing of that Gospel, they and their children were freed from such a bondage: or take it in his own phrase; though the covenant of works and her children were cast out of the Church, yet the covenant of Grace and her children are still remaining in Gods Church.

P. Therefore whereas M. *P.* tells us in pag. 145 that the forementioned Objection is answered, and that we have no ground in Gods word for Infant-baptism: ——

A. He hath not given the least shew of an Answer to the Objection, but it still stands in force, as is by this manifest; and notwithstanding all his vain distinctions, workings, and counterworkings, of Scriptures, to make them speak a word of comfort to his practice, doctrine, and opinion, and of confutation to us; they still cry out in the behalf of childrens right to the seal; as those little ones did, who met Christ with branches of Palm-trees; *Blessed is he that cometh to us in the name of the Lord, Hosanna in the highest.* Reader, we are run through the main body of all his Arguments and Scriptures, what remains behind is very little; onely heats of spirit against such as will not follow him to the Rivers side, and so like those blind men Christ speaks of, *follow a blind guide till they both tumble into the water.* But because the temper of his spirit shall be seen, I shall therefore briefly touch upon the remainder as it comes to hand.

CHAP.

CHAP. XX.

Contains the Answer to many Scriptures by him abused: to the end ——

Pag. 145. HE quotes *Ezek.* 14. 2, 3, 4, 5. *The word of the Lord came to me saying, Son of man, these men have set up their Idols in their hearts, and put the stumbling block of their iniquity before their faces, should I be inquired of by these,* &c?

P. In which place you see, when souls set up an Idol in their hearts, God doth answer them according to that Idol. Therefore such as defend Infant-baptism from a covenant of Grace in the flesh, they defend and maintain a dangerous error, and consequently, it must be rotten and false.

A. Well argued Sir, is it not? who is it that hath set up an Idol in his heart? what all the Churches of Christ throughout the world? Surely were not your heart swell'd with pride, though yet pretending a voluntary humility, to catch souls into your snares; you durst not speak such condemning words, to abuse the way and Word of God.

P. Pag. 146. He gives another result; childrens baptism hath no ground from the word of God, either command or example, but only a consequence; so that it is meerly a tradition of mens setting up, in the room and place of the commands of God, to wit, baptism of believers, and thus they make void the commands of God, *Mar.* 7 7 and this is the very sin of those that plead for Infant-baptism, when Gods word saith *Repent and be baptized, and arise, why tarryest thou? be baptized.* These and many more are made void by christening of children, and thus poor souls are nurst up in ignorance, *&c.*

A. It had been far better to have overturned our practice by dint of Argument, Scripture and Reason, and to have left out all such superfluity of naughtiness, which tends onely to reviling. these Texts have been already answered, and our practice hath appeared to be warranted from the covenant of Grace, and the pleasing consent of Scriptures, which is undenyable to any man that is not pertinacious in his errors; it is an Ordinance, that the Churches of Christ stand possest of, and doth he think to perswade good men from their Religion, Reason, and Conscience, by telling us it is a teaching for Doctrines, the Traditions of men? He must therefore come to a new result

result, and tell us when the Tradition began, in what age or time, who was the first Author; it was not set up by Antichrist, he is little more then of 1200 yeers standing. And as M. *Cobbet* in his answer to *Down* and *Blackwood*, with several others, who have laboured to finde out the first rise, cleers it, to be the practice of the Churches for hundreds of yeers before Antichrist rose; to conclude this, if it be a Tradition, it was received from the man Christ Jesus, who tells us, *of such is the kingdom.*

P. Pag 147. He brings *Lev* 10. 1, 2. and compares Infant-baptism, *to their offering strange fire to God*, which he had not commanded, for which God burnt them with fire from heaven.

A. Tis a very good lesson well learnt, but by that rule he would be put by as a person not fit for a Minister of the Gospel; how much strange fire hath he cast up and down these Nations, such, by which he hath at least endeavoured to burn down whole Churches? And how much strange water hath he overwhelmed poor weak Christians by, to the dishonor of God and his ways? God is gentle in driving his flock, and the tender Lambs he carries in his bosom, and gives them rest; and tells them his yoak is easie: but his opinion and practice is to perswade the people of God that they serve a hard Master, &c.

That be they never so weak and tender, yet must they stoop to a destructive practice, and that in the sharpest seasons, as if men and women were made of some other mettle, and not flesh and blood. But methinks the Scripture he brings should make him see his error. If *Nadab* and *Abihues* sin was offering up such fire which he commanded not, then it seems God expected, they should pick out his meaning, by comparing things rationally together; for they had no express command not to offer such, or what fire they should offer, but fire they were to offer. by which we see, if God gives but the hint of a truth, he will have his children to finde out the whole: so that, had we onely the hint of Gods minde touching *Abrahams* covenant, how it took in believers and their seed under the Old Testament; and it being a covenant of pure grace, and therefore unchangable; reaching to the Gentiles, and such an example as he gave in *Zacheus* a Gentile, calling him a son of *Abraham*, and therefore salvation was come to his house: I say such hints as these, had we nothing else to say, were enough for us Gentiles to pick out the rest; that if they had *Abrahams* covenant and blessing given, then in the same extent, and surely the seal must follow. I onely touch this by the by. It hath

hath been before cleared, that every part and parcel of Gods word is for us, to justifie our practice of Infant-baptism.

But suppose his own sense of this place were to be understood concerning *Nadab* and *Abihu*, as a reproof to us for practising things without a command, in so many expres words, or syllables; then also it is offering up strange fire in his sense, for Christians under the Gospel to keep the Sabboth; because it is not so expresly commanded in the New-Testament: which without any peradventure must upon the account he pleads be his judgement; and were it not for a curbing power, I doubt would quickly be his practice. But take heed M. P. that your heart be not rotten in this, lest strange fire or strange water make you a like example with those persons before mentioned.

P. Pag. 148. He applyes these Texts to our practice, *Jer.* 9. 13, 14, 15. 1 *Sam.* 13. 12, 13. *Jer.* 8 9. *Because they have forsaken my Law, and walked after the imaginations of their own hearts; therefore I will give them to feed on wormwood, and give them the water of Gall to drink, and will consume them. Again, therefore the wife are dismayed and ashamed, they have rejected the word of the Lord. Therefore will I give their wives to others,* &c. *They have built the high places of Tophet in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and daughters in the fire, which I commanded them not.*

A. What could this Author say more, and how could the Scriptures be more abused, and the powers of the Nations be more strook at? his voice speaks nothing but Gall and Wormwood, and consumings, and giving our wives to others, and telling us we sacrifice our children to devils, offer them to our own inventions, set up our posts by Gods posts, and our selves in the room of God? Is there not (think you) a young Pope sprung up in these Nations, who begins to throw fire out of his sleeve to terrifie the world? Magistrates, are you all asleep? I am sure you are not all Anabaptists, you own the Ordinance of Infant-baptism. Why will you suffer it to be reproacht, and Christ therein? Do you not see the language he gives you for offering your children to God, which he calls to the devil? for such are Idolaters devil-worshippers, *Rom.* 9. 10. 1 *Cor.* 10. 19, 20, 21. *Deut.* 32. 17. *Psal.* 106. 36, 37. is Satan ever the more to be hugged in the bosom for his bringing of Scripture, when it is onely to hide the Serpents sting in the tayl? Awake, awake, put on strength, O thou Arm of the Lord. Consider what your duty is touching the first Table, and remember honest *New-England*.

P. The Scripture by M. P. quoted against us, is 2 *Cor.* 26. 14, 15.

of

of *Uzza* who fearing the fall of the Ark, put his hand to it to bear it up without a command, and King *Uzziah* who medled with *burning Incence*, without Authority from God. And *being wroth with the Ministers of God*, the leprosie rose up in his forehead and Gods wrath brake forth upon him.

A. If these Texts by him cited, are not applyed to his own heart; it is a sign he is obdurat, and some sad judgements are like to befal him; for the places are directly parallel to his own practice: what did *Uzza* do, that M. *P.* doth not? Hath he not put to his hand to stay up the Ark of God without a command or call to the Ministery? yea rather, is he not endeavouring to his utmost to pull it down? What did *Uzziah* do, that he doth not? *It appertaineth not to thee Uzziah to burn Incence to the Lord, Go out of the Sanctuary, for thou hast sinned. And it shall not be for thine honor from the Lord God*, ver. 18. Did God punish a King? and shall it be unpunisht in a mean man, who not onely intrudes, but also strikes the faithful Ministers and servants of God with his Censor, I mean with a reviling tongue? but it shall not be for his honor from the Lord God. Remember the judgement of *Uzza* and *Uzziah*, and apply it inwardly.

P. He comes now again to appeal to such as fear God, and advise them, to take heed of such an Idol. And to any that is not blinded with the stumbling block of their iniquity, by reason of Satans subtilty, to judge how they cross the doctrines of the Gospel, in baptising visible, graceless, Christless children:

A. This appeal is made to you that fear the Lord, you see what his four last words speak, visible, graceless, Christless children, but why visible? was *Isaac* so when an Infant, who was the seed of promise? and doth not *Paul* tell us, as he was, we are *children of the promise*? If as he was, then as the seed of covenanting believers as he was, *Gal.* 4. 28. See the censorious spirit of this man, who is not ashamed to say, believers seed are visibly graceless, when as *Paul* tells us they are to be *reputed holy*: 1 Cor. 7. Which way, saith the false Prophet, *went the Spirit of the Lord from me to you*, when he strikes *Micaiah* on the cheek? If the Apostle tells us that children are holy, Mr. *Patient* will be sure to flye in his face and say, they are graceless, Christless children.

However, you to whom the appeal is made, receive it, and when you have done, make your complaint to God, and be not frighted from owning those which God owns, the King is bound to maintain the cause of his subjects. And such are Infants. *For of such is the*

kingdom. And God will in due time plead the quarrel of his covenant, against all their opposers, it will be seen in this generation.

P. p. 153. He comes to lay down an Objection of such as would have no baptism at all; which though it doth not so properly relate to us that maintain it, yet

A. I shall give the Reader this hint, whatsoever he saith, for dipping of believers, it hath been already answered. And therefore let me advise you to be so far either from casting off the Ordinance, or imbracing a false Ordinance; that you keep close to that good old way of baptising the family-Infants of Jesus Christ, and for the better strengthening of such, whose weakness may not be able to oppose Satans depths: as that good woman once said, she could dye for Christ, but was not able enough to dispute for him. Besides what is before laid down, consider *Mat.* 21. 43. *The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to another nation, bringing forth the fruits thereof.* The kingdom of God there mentioned, was the Church of the Jews who had the laws and the Ordinances of worship amongst them; in which kingdom were included as subjects, men, women, and children by vertue of Gods covenant made with *Abraham*, the father of all Church-incorporated-believers, both Jews and Gentiles, then and now. Now saith Christ, this kingdom of God should be taken from the Jews, and given to the Gentiles; from whence then we may easily gather, that if Gods kingdom now given to the Gentiles, be the same for substance, with that which was taken away from the Jews; then must the Infants of Church-believers, be also subjects of this kingdom, as they were then; and the reason is undeniable, because it is implyed in the words of Christ. Not to be another, but the same kingdom; for had the Jews been fruitful subjects, the kingdom had still remained with them, and not been removed.

A second place to be considered is that of *Paul*, *Heb.* 3. 5. 6. *And Moses verily was faithful in his house as a servant. But Christ as a son over his own house, whose house are we.* The Apostles intent was to draw a parallel betwixt the family of God then, and now; in both which families Christ was the son. And the first house was as well Christs house, as the second, *Mat.* 21. 13. *Isa.* 56. 7. compared, the inference is this, that as the family of Christ in the first Gospel-house to *Israel* did consist partly of children, so doth the family of Christ in this second Gospel-house, consist of the same; for it would be unreasonable to think, that Christ had changed the family, and so cut off children now; such thoughts represent him to be less faithful then *Moses* who was but a servant.

Obj.

Obj. *But what command have you for your practice? these are natural inferences, but nothing should be practised without a command.*

A. If this Objection be admitted, then as before, the Sabboth is null; because there is not a cleer New-Testament command to keep it, and yet should it not be observed, the Ordinances of the Gospel must fall. For what Ordinances can be practised, if there be not a time appointed by Christ that shall bind all Christians, which yet must be found out from Scriptures compared, the old-Testament and new, being laid together and not severed, with the constant practice of all Christian Churches from the primitive time, so that they may as well make the Sabboth-day Antichristian, because it wants such an institution, as Infant-baptism, for they are inseparable twins.

2 But the Scriptures do hold forth a command from *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go and disciple all Nations, baptizing,* &c. It hath been before cleered, that this command reaches children: to which I refer the Reader in answer to his four Essentials: But the sadness of our times is, that men have such itching ears, that notwithstanding the Scriptures speak and the spirit speaks, and Gods Ministers speak, yet they will not hear.

3 We that are children under the Gospel, have also a Gospel-father to look at. For when the father of a family receives rules to walk by, and to order his children, it is reasonable that they should submit. Now the bond of the covenant was given as the standing rule of the house, to *Abraham* as the Church-Father of all covenanting believers, both Jews and Gentiles, *Rom* 4. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. *Gal.* 4. 28. And therefore if he had a command to in-church his seed whilst Infants, *Gen.* 17 9, 10. and to give them the token of the covenant in their generations; then look what token or seal God shall affix to his covenant, either of circumcision then, or baptism now; it is and ought to be obliging to all his seed to a thousand generations, *Psal.* 105. 8. till Christ shall remove it; and had not the example of *Abraham* as a father been binding to the seed, the Apostle would not have turned the Christian Churches of the Gentiles to look upon *Abraham*, thereby to rectifie their mistakes in doctrines of faith, *Ro.* 4 1, 2: 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 23, 24. *c.* 11, 16, 2c *Gal.* 3. 6, 7, 8, 9, so that it is apparent that what command was given to *Abraham* as a father, in the sense beforementioned, is in force to all his children: that Objection therefore is null: —— Having laid down these things to be duly weighed, I shall pass over many pages which he hath written to such as are against all baptism, and shall give him a meeting in tother side.

P. Pag. 160. But some will say they are not drawn forth by a divine power to embrace it, though convinc'd, to which M. *P.* answers, that where God gives grace, there he doth give a power to submit to all his ways, and so to this of plunging.

A. Tis an undoubted truth, that as God gives grace, he gives power, yet Gods grace doth not lead man to destroy nature; therefore when he comes to apply, he abuses the Scripture; it hath been before proved, that dipping is not the way of Scripture-baptism. Consider: *Cor.* 10. 1, 2. and compare it with the history: was *Israel* plunged in the Red-Sea? the opposers dare not say it if they have any Conscience. And yet *Paul* tells us they were baptized, and *David* in the place before quoted tells us, how the clouds poured forth water: the like appears from *Act.* 1. 3. ch. 2. 17. with *Joel* 2. compared, t'is cleer that baptism was by pouring out water: to intrude such a destructive practice is therefore against the Apostolical interpretation of the word, and against the very light of divine or humane reason: for shall we think that he that bids us *put on as the beloved of God, bowels of mercy, and tenderness*, should be so hard a master, to command us in the most sharpest seasons to be duckt; yea, an action that cannot be done in many Countries? for shame, harden not your hearts against truth any longer, and be of a more tender hearted spirit to poor deluded Christians; and do you that fear the Lord, remember that you do not abuse your power God hath given; to such licencious practice, that would ruine the very foundations of the Gospel.

P. p. 164. Doth acknowledge there may be good people not of his opinion, yet they are not to be lookt upon as a Church, unless they will be dipt.

A. He hath before called us such as offer up our children to devils, and can he have so much charity to judge such good people? these are but terms of insinuations to gain the more upon such good people to bring them into his strain of discipleship. He brings us again, the example of *Cornelius*, *Lydia*, the Jaylor, and then tells us the Church of *Samaria* was gathered by faith and dipping: and to practice otherwise, is contrary to Christ and the Apostles. All which is before proved false, and there is not a word in the Scriptures that saith as M. *P.* doth, that the Church mentioned was gathered by dipping: yea so to practice and apply it as he doth, is to adulterate, and so destroy the Ordinance. Away therefore with such stuffe, tis abominable: it is likely, is it not; that *Peter* could stand a whole day in a River, to plunge

plunge 3000 souls, or that *Lydia* should be duckt, before she went home? or that the Jaylor should be plunged in a deep River at midnight? were Jesus Christ preacht to the Turks or Pagans, upon these terms, by some of those dippers, or to the Jews, upon their imbracing the faith, it is the way to harden their hearts against the truth. —

P. p.172,173. He perswades Christians it is a sin to neglect plunging, and if they have truely repented, they will be drawn to practice all the commands of God, and this amongst the rest; or else they cannot be admitted as persons that have repented at all.

A. We may here see the mystery of iniquity in its workings: It must Lord it in the Conscience, or else it cannot stand: thus did those Circumcision-preachers, *Act.* 15. there was no salvation without it, as here, there is no repentance true without dipping, it is a sin to neglect it, Christians look to your Consciences, keep out such false-teachers, who bring upon you greater burdens then Circumcision ever was, Christs house will have no such washings, and if you once let them into your Conscience, possession will be soon lost.

P. p.174. But some will say they were baptized in their infancy, and shall such be kept out that are good people? To which he answers, that though many are good, yet they live in a sin, though it be a sin of ignorance to them; for otherwise they could not be Christians. But however the Church knows it to be a sin, therefore they ought to be kept out; and if any such be in, that baptize their children, they ought to be cast out. —

A. The Reader may still see his censorious spirit, wherein he flyes in the face of all the Ministers of Christ, wounding their credit and esteem in the hearts of Christians. For whosoever doth knowingly oppose their dipping, and not ignorantly, cannot be gracious, so that either the Ministery must be ignorant, or graceless. And that their Church knows it to be a sin, and therefore ought to keep out, and cast out such as practice it.

A. I hope you shall have no cause to threaten such with casting out: and if you speak in the name of all the Anabaptists, when you say the Church knows it to be a sin, I must then needs say they are as ignorant as your self, though it is hard so to be. —

P. In p.176. he useth another way to make us yield up to his practice, and answers an Objection that some do make, that though it be an Ordinance, yet many do rest in it: and therefore its better not to practice it: he grants that many do rest in them, yet he would admonish all those that fear God to be conformable, so was *Paul* Gal. 1. 16

so was *Peter*, when Christ bids him let down his net, so was *Abraham* in sacrificing his son; he disputed not, and therefore he would have Christians suck in this as a maxim, never to dispute a command, and so he concludes his whole with *Phil.* 2, 12. *Do all things without murmurings and disputings.*

2. We are now drawing to an end, in all which we may see how many ways, and wiles the Tempter hath, to get within us; he useth his weapons every way, and comes so high now, that it is a sin against Conscience to dispute it, and it must be suckt down as a maxim, which I could easily grant, if it could be proved that either the subject, or manner were commanded as it is by him practised. But he that so sucks it in, had as good suck down Ratsbane. The instances brought are of such who had a cleer command, for what they did from Christ himself, hold forth therein nothing relating to dipping. In fine we may say of his whole book, it is nothing else but a lump of error and bitter revilings against the ways of God, and Ministery of his word, wherein he hath dealt like those unfaithful spyes, that went to view the Land of promise, who by the ill reports he makes, disturbs the multitude, and sets them a murmuring against Gods *Joshuas*; that so his people may either retreat back to *Egypt*, or run into *Babylon*. His charge against us appears to be false, the truth is cleered from the contempt and reproach cast upon it, Reader. I shall therefore commit thee to the grace & keeping of our *L.* Jesus Christ. *And as for such who turn aside to their wicked ways, the Lord shall lead them forth with the workers of iniquity.* But peace shall be upon *Israel*, *Psal.* 125. 5.

FINIS.